DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 722 EC 123 532

TITLE	Skills Assessment, Training and Evaluation of Personnel Serving Developmentally Disabled Individuals. Conference Proceedings (Detroit, Michigan, June 23-29, 1979).
INSTITUTION	Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. Inst. for the Study of Mental Retardation.; Ohio State Univ., Columbus.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Human Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Developmental Disabilities.
PUB DATE	Jun 79
GRANT	50-P-25641
NOTE	67p.; Contains some light print.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Competency Based Education; *Competency Based Teacher Education; Conference Proceedings; Criterion Referenced Tests; *Developmental Disabilities; Federal Legislation; Professional Continuing Education; *Skills; *Supervisory Training; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The report presents selected elements of information exchanged and activities which took place during a Department of Health, Education and Welfare Region V 1979 conference on skills assessment, training, and evaluation of personnel serving the developmentally disabled. Aspects considered include legislative history, criterion referenced testing, American Association on Mental Deficiency continuing education, supervisory training strategies, skill assessment techniques, and resources and processes. A summary of conference recommendations is also included. Among the appendixes are final conference agenda, a list of conference participants, a summary of the conference program evaluation, and a copy of the Michigan State Plan for Developmental Disabilities. (DLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

H.E.W. REGION V
THE INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF MENTAL RETARDATION AND RELATED DISABILITIES, THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT IN TRAINING DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES PERSONNEL, ISMRRD, THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
U.A.P. CONSORTIUM PROJECT, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
REGIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES OFFICE

ED185722

Conference Proceedings
Skills Assessment, Training and Evaluation of Personnel Serving Developmentally Disabled Individuals

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

EC 123 530

Conference Proceedings

Skill Assessment, Training and the Evaluation of Personnel Serving Developmentally Disabled Individuals

H.E.W. Region V

Consultation Conference

Detroit Michigan

June 23-29, 1979

Presented by

The Institute for the Study of Mental Retardation
and Related Disabilities
University of Michigan,

U.A.P. Consortium Project
Ohio State University

and

Developmental Disabilities Office
H.E.W. Region V

This report was supported by grant number 50-P-25641 from the Region V Office of Developmental Disabilities, Office of Human Development Services, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Grantees are encouraged to express their judgment in professional and technical matters. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily represent official Office of Developmental Disabilities, Office of Human Development Services, or Department of Health, Education, and Welfare position or policy.

PREFACE

This document attempts to report selected elements of activities and information that was exchanged during the two day H.E.W. Region V Skills Assessment Consultation/Conference.

The didactic presentations, which formed the background for our discussions, are briefly summarized rather than presented verbatim. We have also abstracted the content of the panel reactions, small group discussions and general comments from various individuals. The decision to do this was predicated by our desire to provide a document of reasonable size which captured the essence of the participants' contributions to the Conference.

In producing this document, we have worked from tape recordings of the sessions. As a result, we must emphasize that the content of this document, with the exception of the material in the appendices, is solely our responsibility. The comments and content attributed to particular individuals may or may not be a totally accurate representation of what was said.

For those who are interested in the specific content of the didactic presentations, we urge you to contact the individual presenters. You will find their names and organizational affliation along with a brief description of their presentation under the section "Summary of Skills Assessment Presentations." Your decision to seek further contact may be assisted by scanning the "Program Evaluations by Participants" which appears in the appendices or by discussing the presentations with a colleague who was in attendance.

We would like to thank those individuals who encouraged and supported the development of the program including Ronald Kozlowski, Director of the U.A.F. Consortium Project and Robert Vogt, Assistant Regional Program Director, H.E.W. Region V Developmental Disabilities Office.

Those primarily responsible for the outcomes of the consultation/conference reported in this document were the participants who gave of their time and energy to address this issue. They are identified in the Appendix.

Our wish is that you will find this report of our deliberations of value in planning for the assessment and training of personnel serving developmentally disabled individuals.

E. Eugene Handley, Ph.D.
Program Chairman

Bennett H. Berman, Ed.D.
Program Co-Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS 2

I. BACKGROUND 3

II. CONTENT OVERVIEW 5

A. Welcome .....Robert Vogt 5
B. Introduction .....Eugene Handley 5
C. Legislative History .....Robert McNeil.....6
D. Summaries of Didactic Presentations 9
1. Criterion Reference Testing .....Melvin Montmerlo..... 9
2. AAMD Continuing Education .....Richard Scheerenberger .10
3. Supervisory Training Strategies ..Richard Miller 11
4. Skill Assessment Techniques .....Thomas Kramlinger 11
5. Resources and Processes .....Joseph Nava 12
E. Panel Reaction to Day #1 12

III. PROCESS OUTCOMES 18

A. Group Discussions by Single Function 18
B. Group Discussions by Mixed Function: Reports 19
1. Group #1 .....John Zang, Arthur Benson, Jerry Adams ..19
2. Group #2 .....Ray Ramirez 23
3. Group #3 .....Paul Shankland 24
C. Panel Reaction to Group Discussions and Recommendations 25
D. Selected Comments from Participants: Reaction to Panel Comments 29
E. Closing Remarks .....Eugene Handley 31

IV. Summary of Recommendations 32

APPENDICES

A. FINAL AGENDA 34
B. PARTICIPANTS 36
C. MICHIGAN PLAN 41
D. SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION 57
E. LEGISLATION 59

I. BACKGROUND

Recent revisions in the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 1978 impact directly on the area of personnel development. Section 511 of the act regarding the Developmental Disabilities State Planning Council's annual plans for the provision of services includes a portion entitled "Professional Assessment and Evaluation Systems".

(6) "The plan must provide for -
(A) an assessment of the adequacy of the skill level of professionals and paraprofessionals serving persons with developmental disabilities in the State and the adequacy of the State programs and plans for supporting training of such professionals and paraprofessionals in maintaining the high quality of services provided to persons with developmental disabilities in the State; and
(B) the planning and implementation of an evaluation system (in accordance with section 110(a))."

Contained in the legislation are four charges to be addressed by the state plan:

1. Assess the adequacy of the skill level of professionals and paraprofessionals serving the Developmentally Disabled population;
2. Plan for supporting training of such individuals;
3. Plan an evaluation system; and
4. Implement the evaluation system.

Those familiar with the area of personnel development recognize the magnitude of the charge and the immensity of the tasks related to the implementation of the mandate. It was proposed that a meeting be convened of recognized experts in our states, region and country to advise in the implementation of the legislation. As a result of the meeting, specific strategies and recommendations were to be disseminated to the states to assist them in plan development in compliance with the intent of the legislation. The task was a major one in that the following questions must be addressed in the process of identifying recommendations in this area:

1. What are the essential services provided to developmentally disabled individuals in our region?
2. Who are the professionals and paraprofessionals essential to the delivery of these services?
3. How does one measure the adequacy of the services?
4. What are the skills essential to providing adequate services?
5. How does one measure the skill level of the service provider?
6. How does one plan for coordinated state-wide training for all professionals and paraprofessionals?

Significant progress has been made within H.E.W. Region V in anticipation of this mandate. All of the state plans in Region V address the issue of staff development in some form. The Technical Assistance Project in Training Developmental Disabilities Personnel, located at the Institute for

the Study of Mental Retardation and Related Disabilities, has addressed this issue in meetings with State Planning Councils, conducted a survey of staff training activities within the cooperating states, produced documents describing the sources of funding for training and personpower planning, and identified significant individuals in each of the states responsible for training personnel who serve the DD population. The project worked closely with other Institute staff in the planning and implementation of the Consultation/Conference.

Utilizing funds provided through the Region V U.A.F. Consortium Project, the Institute for the Study of Mental Retardation and Related Disabilities (ISMRRD), in cooperation with the Region V Technical Assistance in Training Developmental Disabilities Personnel Project designed and implemented the "consultation/conference." Invited to participate in the conference were individuals from the following groups:

1. Nationally recognized experts in the field of personnel training and development;
2. Directors of training from selected state agencies serving the developmentally disabled;
3. State council and agency staff responsible for the planning of strategies related to the legislation;
4. Individuals with experience in identification of training skills and needs in human service systems;
5. Individuals representing professional and paraprofessional personnel; and
6. Representatives from the Region's University Affiliated Facilities (UAF's).

This group met for two days to consider the problem and develop recommendations for action. This report of the findings of the "consultation/conference" is being disseminated to the state planning councils and related human service agencies in H.E.W. Region V. Recipients of the document will be contacted in two months and asked to describe ways in which the materials were utilized.

II. CONTENT OVERVIEW

In this section, the opening remarks and keynote presentation are included virtually intact. This will enable the reader to capture the essence of the Conference mission and the important legislative history related to Section 511.

The presentations of the invited training experts, internal and external to the developmental disabilities care provider system are summarized. The editors have attempted to present the highlights of each resource person's comments.

The structure of this Conference was to concentrate the first day's activity on information input and to devote the second day to inter-active discussions, problem solving, and the development of specific recommendations.

A. Welcoming Remarks

Robert Vogt:

On behalf of the Region V Developmental Disabilities Office I'd like to welcome you to this Skills Assessment/Consultation Conference. The process of skill assessment has been with us for a while, at least it has been at a level of conversation and bylaws amongst the developmental disabilities councils and our university-based training programs, UAF's. With the amendments to the law, it is now mandated as a mission for the state, in this case, the state council, to design how we are going to perform this skill assessment. That is probably akin to mission impossible. I think that is why you are here today to try to tell us, to share with us, how we might begin to approach the problem. This conference is the culmination of the thinking of the state councils and the university-based programs who have met over the past two years. This is the last of a series of conferences we sponsored that have looked at high priority areas. This one being the newest, and I think one of the most difficult to deal with, I have no answers. What I would like to do now is end my welcoming comments and thank you for coming. I think our conference will be very successful. Maybe somewhat frustrating by the time we've finished, but it has to be done and we're looking for options to implement the law. As far as I know we're the first ones either smart enough or dumb enough to try to do this. We'll soon find out what success we are going to have.

B. Introduction

Eugene Handley:

The best title for this part of the program presentation is "Seven Little Lines." This conference is essentially built around seven little lines of legislation that are monumental in their challenge. To help us with an understanding of where we are headed for the next two days, we thought it would be important to provide you with background information

about the general development of the new legislation. I think it is an interesting history. Mr. Robert McNeil, in working with the American Association of University Affiliated Programs in Washington, was heavily involved in that process from the beginning, the middle, and now the implementation of the legislation. Because of that, I believe that he can present a perspective that would be helpful to us.

C. Legislative History

Robert McNeil:

I am delighted to be here this morning. I had encouraged Gene Handley to invite Seldon Todd, Executive Director of the American Association of University Affiliated Programs to address the historical background because he had a great deal to do with the Section 511, which is the subject of this meetin . In that he was unable to attend, I will try to provide you with as much information as Seldon and I have in reference to the intent of Congress in adding this provision to the law and the intent of those who participated in the process that led to its inclusion.

First of all, there is in Washington a fairly effective coalition of organizations that work in this area with the Congress. It's called the Consortium Concerned with the Developmentally Disabled (CCDD). Membership of that group includes, in addition to the Association of University Affiliated Programs, such groups as the National Association for Retarded Citizens, the Epilepsy Foundation, and the Council for Exception Children. That group has been together about five years and it has been fairly effective. The groups are now able to speak with some degree of coherence to Congress and the effect of that was notable last year in that the Consortium actually did draft a bill that ultimately became a House bill which ultimately became, in great measure, the Developmental Disabilities Amendments of 1978. Section 511 was one of the provisions that was added to the law initially in the draft prepared by this Consortium. The American Association of University Affiliated Programs, speaking now as a semi-official representative of the UAF organization, had a great deal to do with encouraging the inclusion of this language. We felt it had some very direct relevance to the issue of the role of the UAF program and the relationship of that program with the state councils. The section essentially amends part of the earlier law which deals with state plans. It now requires that the plan provide for an assessment of the adequacy of the skill level of professionals and paraprofessionals serving persons with developmental disabilities and the adequacy of the state programs and plans supporting training of such professionals and paraprofessionals.

To begin with, there were a number of factors and considerations that very specifically relate the addition of this language to the act. I would like briefly to go over them. First of all, I think many who have been in this field for the last few years would agree that the UAFs, at least as they were perceived by the state people, were not being as responsive as they should be to the off-campus, non-university source of needs that were evident to those people in the field. This attitude was certainly most notable on the part of state agency representatives and state council

members. Whether it was a reasonable attitude or not, is not important. I'm just saying that it was fact, and it remains a fact that there has been and there remains a somewhat difficult relationship, at least in some areas. UAF's were seen, by some, as just another form of higher education with a very limited utility in the real world. However, one of the original ideas behind the UAF program, which was established by some federal legislation in the early 60's, was to make the universities more useful, and to give them more utility with regard to the needs of the mentally retarded population. In my opinion, the UAF program presents a very considerable variety in terms of types of programs, which are not easy to characterize as a group.

On the other side of the coin, many of the UAF representatives believe that the councils, and many of the state agencies, have been less than effective. They resented the attempts that they felt were uncalled for to dictate the UAF program's direction and pointed to the very limited budget provided by the Developmental Disabilities Program which is only 5% or 6% of the total of the UAF budget. They ask why this small amount of support justified more than just a passing interest in the problems on the part of the DD Councils and state agencies. As many of you know, most of the UAF's support is provided by the Maternal and Child Health Agency in HEW which is a child health medical model and is to some extent inconsistent, not with just the expectations of the developmental disabilities program, but the very wording of the DD law itself. Since most services to the developmentally disabled population are personal services, provided by persons who must be trained and possess special skills, one wonders why these university-based centers, which consistitute a major resource for providing these trained people, and the state people who were charged with improving services to the developmentally disabled, are at such odds, if indeed they are.

The fundamental issues became how does a university-based program constructively and realistically contribute to the work of the councils, contribute to the entire process of implementing the developmental disabilities program nationally, and still comply with their own mandates and missions that they had set for themselves and had set for them by federal law. In other words, how could they assist in this planning process and still not contradict what they were all about?

Before we can examine that question, it seems to me, first we have to question how much of a problem the adequacy of the training received by the professionals in this field presents. How extensively should we be examining such issues as the quality of diagnosis, treatment planning, and the actual services that are ultimately delivered? Should not the state plan deal with training and the issue of quality of services in addition to quantity? Section 511 was really intended to force an acknowledgement that quality is important in addition to quantity of services. And if quality is important, then training is an important part of quality. One thing that was not directly behind the inclusion of this provision in the law was the notion that we need more estimates of numbers of people needed. While quantity is important, the major thrust behind 511 represents a judgement that the UAF role is that of assisting in assessing the quality of services and developing plans to improve the quality, rather than dealing with the quantity issue. I have some problem with that because in many areas of the

country it is hard to really get to the quality issue because of such a problem of quantity. In New Mexico, for example, there are many deficits, among them the availability of services for the developmentally disabled. I think that's true in any essentially poor and/or rural state. While the intent may well be that 511 forces us to deal with quality, it seems to me that we should not overlook the quantity issue. Universities and councils should continue to work together to determine how many services we need and in what areas we need them. 511 is very short, obviously. It doesn't specifically require that the UAF do anything. It is not in the part of the law that relates to the UAF facility. Clearly it would violate the idea that councils are charged with developing a state plan if we were to put in there certain requirements that UAF's do certain things.

However, there is a provision in the law elsewhere, it's section 121-B2, which is part of the basic authority for the UAF program and the developmental disabilities law. This law gives certain discretionary authority to HEW, and permits them, assuming they have the appropriations to do so, to award funds to selected UAF's to assess the needs for trained personnel. While that language relates, obviously, more directly to the quantity issue, the intent was that it be an encouragement to implement 511, essentially a means by which the UAF program can carry out the intent of Section 511.

I suppose that when we examine the law and we try to determine what exactly it was intended to mean, we could come up with a number of interpretations. What I've tried to give you is the intent of those who drafted the provision that ultimately became Section 511 and the provision that I just quoted, which is intended to go hand-in-hand with 511. Whether or not HEW will carry out that intent remains to be seen. I suppose we are all free to interpret it as we think best, and I suppose it is too early to say what exactly is going to happen. There does not seem to be a great deal of consistency between these two provisions. It seems to me that if you hear what those who wrote this provision intended and then read the law there are some clear inconsistencies.

There is one other point that I want to touch on. The language itself is in a provision that also relates to evaluation. It's the opinion of some of those people who worked on this language, that the language of 511 itself is too formal and that Congress somehow confused Section 511 with formal evaluation. It was not intended, as I understand, that there be any kind of certification process of professionals as a result of this language. Rather, it was intended that this be a fairly informal process. The intent was simply that the quality of services is important and that the UAF's represent a resource which should be utilized in our attempts to try to discern the best answer for determining whether the quality is adequate. There are no pre-determined formulas for doing this, but if we work together, I suspect we can probably come up with the best one.

511, in my view, is really a challenge to all the participants in this field to work together, work more closely, work more cooperatively. I agree that in this region you have a greater degree of cooperation than elsewhere in the country. I hope the other regions will follow suit. There are now two national organizations that represent the entities that we are considering here, the American Association of University Affiliated

Programs organization and the state councils group, the National Conference on Developmental Disabilities. I am affiliated with both. The National Conference on Developmental Disabilities intends to form a national organization and to open a Washington office. The University Affiliated Programs have already done this, as you know. I am hopeful that we can get the two organizations to cooperate in a venture which on a national level will ultimately assist in the implementation of this section 511. I am also hopeful that this meeting will provide a foundation for such an effort.

D. SUMMARIES OF DIDACTIC PRESENTATIONS

During the two day conference, information sharing activities were conducted by training experts internal and external to the developmental disabilities care provider system. Each expert was invited to make a 45 minute presentation followed by a question and answer session. Each presentation was to examine some aspect of skills assessment as it might relate to implementing Section 511.

The presenters and topics were:

Melvin Montmerlo, Ph.D. U.S. Army	Criterion Reference Testing in Assessing Skills
Richard Sheerenberger, Ph.D., FAAMD Central Wisconsin Center for the Developmentally Disabled	The AAMD Continuing Education Program
Richard Miller, Ph.D. Michigan Department of Social Services	Supervisory Training Strategies
Thomas Kramlinger, Ph.D. Wilson Learning Company	Skill Assessment Techniques: An Overview
Joseph Nava U.S. Civil Service	Resources and Process: The Role of the Office of Leadership Development in the U.S. Civil Service Commission

Melvin Montmerlo:

Dr. Montmerlo examined Criterion Reference Testing (CRT) as an assessment tool for implementing Section 511. He reviewed the skill assessment strategy currently used to classify Army personnel in over 300 jobs. By 1982, the Army estimates it will have used CRT to generate over 1,000 occupational description manuals and skills qualification tests.

Dr. Montmerlo contrasted criterion and norm reference testing for the Conference attendees. He pointed out that while norm reference testing examined performance relative to others, criterion testing was concerned with performance relative to predetermined standards. Criterion Reference Testing in the Army grew out of systems analysis for weapons research.

This systematic approach provided an organized "fixed track" for training and led to the creation of Instructional Development (ISD) manuals.

He stated that the rigid concept of ISD manuals has many flaws; these include the inability of any single manual to deal with every training situation variable and the tendency for the ISD manual to become a rigid "rule maker" resulting in lock-step thinking.

Criterion Reference Testing in the "new" Army, according to Dr. Montmerlo, focuses on the synergism of the tasks that produce the desired result. This requires examination of a task's global nature, the interpersonal elements effecting the task, as well as the special cognitive/technical skills required. CRT is an art, not a science. It requires an interdisciplinary team effort that links (1) a power source/decision maker, (2) an expert on process, and (3) an expert on content. Through CRT, Dr. Montmerlo stated, a feasible commonality or acceptable performance level can be identified more equitably. This technique may provide the basis for a highly effective assessment strategy applicable to the wide range of services, many of which are inter-related, in the developmental disability care provider network.

Richard Scheerenberger:

The pioneering efforts of the American Association on Mental Deficiency (AAMD) at addressing skill assessment through a program of Certification for Continuing Education in Mental Retardation (CEMR) was outlind by Dr. Scheerenberger, past-President of AAMD.

The CEMR Program is composed of six different categories, including teaching, readings, and publications/professional papers, as well as the Category I and II type workshops, conferences and courses. Category I credits are viewed as the most critical for achieving CEMR certification. (For a detailed description of the AAMD CEMR Program, see Mental Retardation, February 1979, p. 1-2.)

After June 30, 1981, the CEMR Program requires that professionals, who desire AAMD certification, earn a total of 150 continuing education credits within 3 years and of these, a minimum of 60 hours must be earned in AAMD approved Category I workshops or conferences. Prior to July 1, 1981, professionals can be certified by completing 75 CEMR hours of which a minimum of 12 hours must be in Category I.

Workshops, conferences or courses submited to AAMD for approval prior to presentation may qualify for Category I recognition. Otherwise, such workshops, conferences and courses can only earn Category II status.

Dr. Scheerenberger stressed that the current program was limited to professionals in the field of mental retardation. Planning is now underway for CEMR Programs directed at paraprofessionals and those who work mainly in a university setting. Any ideas or suggestions for criteria involving any of the CEMR Programs, present or planned, is welcome. (Correspondence or inquiries should be addressed to Dr. Berkowitz whose address appears on the Conference Roster).

The development of the AAMD CEMR Program was the outgrowth of concern for improving the quality of services which is addressed by Section 511. It is hoped that encouraging prospective employment resources, whether public or private, to use AAMD CEMR certification for personnel selection will have a positive effect upon the service system's quality of care.

Richard Miller:

During the luncheon period of the first day, Dr. Miller shared with the group a description of a successful Supervisory Training Program undertaken by the Michigan Department of Social Services. The Program has implications for Section 511 because of its extensive use of consensus rating in Job Analysis to identify the critical elements inherent in a task (job).

Dr. Miller emphasized that this process, like any process that attempts to equitably arrive at standards for employee assessment, requires "time" at all levels of management. Each person who will be using the Job Analysis Rating Form must be trained in its use and be given an opportunity to practice to develop confidence in their use of the technique.

The process of involving the total hierarchy of the organization in the setting of standards through consensus gives each level of the organization a sense of ownership in the activity. This tends to boost morale and increase productivity. Dr. Miller made the point that identifying what has to be done, and how well (criteria), was the first step in skills assessment. Without agreement on these base points, any assessment program would produce hostility, inequity and confusion.

Thomas Kramlinger:

There is a wide repetoire of skill assessment tools available for those charged with assessment responsibilities, reported Dr. Kramlinger. Assessment, by its very title, suggests something is going to be compared against something else. The standard or criteria used as a model of what the skill performance should be requires some type of task or job analysis. What is it that the worker does? How well does it need to be done? There are many techniques that can be used to arrive at this data, but five tend to be used most frequently: (1) Observational - watch the worker while he/she works, describe what he/she does; (2) Algorithm - a flow-charting technique used like a stimulus-response decision making tree; (3) Critical Incident - often used to study jobs with high autonomy where an individual must make a problem-solving decision; (4) Consensus Group - often used when few facts are available and there is a wide range of opinion about what is good/bad performance; and (5) Consumer Research - a relatively unexplored technique in human services, but it may be effective in examining jobs with a high degree of criticism from the client.

Following Dr. Kramlinger's discussion of the various techniques, he underscored the importance of knowing who you are studying. When doing task analysis, you should always work with a mix of individuals using a model of high vs. low performers. The most realistic skill standard is generally found somewhere in between around the mid-point. Another criti-

cal issue is the use of more than one technique when looking at a task. This duality of research increases the prospect of identifying what is and is not job pertinent and quality related. Obviously, if both studies find identical data, your chances of being correct are better. When discrepencies occur, you can re-examine the input to catch errors before implementing the program. Effective, accurate skills assessment is time consuming and represents a substantial investment if it is done correctly.

Joseph Nava:

Mr. Nava, Assistant Director of the Office of Leadership Development, Chicago Region, presented an overview of the U.S. Civil Service Commission's resources and services that State Developmental Disabilities Councils and Departments might tap to help implement skill assessment and training system evaluation. Basically, organizations operating with federal funds can qualify for their help. The Office of Leadership Development is set up as a non-profit "training organization" to assist branches of federal and state government. Many of the services provided are free including numerous publications on training. Most of their workshops and training conferences are available at a much smaller fee than through most other sources.

He stressed to the conference participants the need to make use of all the resources at their disposal, not just from his organization, but from many of the other groups represented at the session, e.g., private consultants, UAFs, and experienced human service researchers within the system.

At the present time, The Office of Leadership Development offers only one course on "Employing the Handicapped in Federal Government," but he anticipates more training programs related to employment and serving the disabled. Most of the courses available in their program relate to general management, training, and office supervisory skills which, while federally oriented, are applicable to any setting. Mr. Nava extended the offer to the group of adding their names to his mailing list and of sending them free copies of a number of pertinent training publications related to assessment and evaluation.

E. PANEL REACTION TO DAY #1

Gene Handley

What we charge our Reaction Panel to do now is not to summarize the content of the days presentations, but instead to react individually as to what was said today and how it has impacted on them. What they own and don't own; what they feel is relevant to their particular role and their particular involvement. What we are asking them is not for conclusions, but for a discussion of the implications of the information and opinions we shared today.

Al Berkowitz

I have a somewhat uncomfortable feeling about what we came together to do. About an hour and a half ago I started to feel like I was sitting in a mutual admiration society. We were all being so terribly cooperative and so wonderful to each other, so complimentary to each other. I began to think that if all of that's happening, why are we here? Why aren't we all home in our own states doing the Lord's good work or maybe the Lord's good work is just being done without too much of an effort. In fact, many of the things that are happening in the states are happening because we haven't talked about some of the knitty gritty that Ben Berman was talking about, the realities of life. My concern was that if the state councils were given a certain charge by this law, and then not given the wherewithal to really implement, but rely on the good nature and the good cooperative spirit that we have to deal with other outsiders to get the job done, we could be running into some kind of trouble. I'm an ex-bureaucrat. I was in Massachusetts in the MR department and we were part of the DD council. The strategy was that if they got us on that council, obviously, we would be part of their advocacy group and we wouldn't have too many differences of opinion. But that didn't work. Indeed, there were differences of opinion. The buck had to stop someplace. We say that an agency is mandated to "X" and is supposed to do something and needs "Y" and "Z" to do it. I think we ought to begin thinking about ways to give "X" some way of implementing "Y" and "Z". I don't believe we can sit back and say that we all work cooperatively because we want to help the same poor, unfortunate people; I don't think it's enough. My great hope was that we would get these people from different agencies together today and gain a better understanding of the trials and tribulations that the other guys are facing, and ensure that cooperative spirit that I think is being taken for granted. I'm going home with many more questions than I came here about our CEMR Program, our continuing education program, in terms of how realistic it is. Is it creating the more causal atmosphere that Dick Miller spoke about? Will it motivate management supervisors to stay informed? Is it more of an enrichment versus a performance strategy? I don't have the answers to that.

Juluis Cohen:

There are an awful lot of thoughts running around in my head right now. It is difficult to try to pull together something, especially for a group, when I feel that I haven't pulled it together for myself yet. That to me is one measure of the value of what today has been. There certainly has been a lot of good things. One of the things that hit me very heavily is the whole issue of the role of the UAF; of what is the UAF, and what does it look like and feel like. We could apply the analogy of the blind men and the elephant—everybody is grabbing onto a different part of it and describing it differently. I listened to people who say what UAF's are or are not and I always want to say "Well, that's not true because we do something different." In Michigan, we have a major community outreach part which Gene provides our leadership for and is a tremendously strong example of what a UAF can do in working within the needs system of community agencies. At the same time, I look at other UAFs in our region and I see them doing things that the Institute just can't do. We don't have those

kinds of skills. I am thinking in terms of our collective utilization. What different kinds of roles can each UAF play? If we took the unique skills of the UAF's and the six states and put them all together, could we say what the elephant would look like? If you're looking for a tail section, go to this UAF, or if you're looking for a leg part, you go to another one, or a trunk, or whatever. There are some things that we're able to do as UAF's that other resources can't, but there's the necessity to avoid duplication, the necessity to coordinate, so that we do a better job at accessing our resources cooperatively. There's a lot of excitement, a lot of potential in that. UAF's are also able to do diagnosis with certain kinds of individuals I think better than most other places. I think that we can effectively demonstrate certain kinds of skills and assessment, both for individuals and for systems, but how do we best access that? The whole aspect of providing input in the planning process, input to the councils is a challenge. The services provided through the UAF's shouldn't be what we think you need, but what you think you need, and what you think we can provide.

There's one measure I use to determine how well people know our Institute. If somebody comes up and says, "Oh, yes, we know the University of Michigan, it's strictly Ivory Tower," I have to write that person's knowledge off. I know they have not worked with us. If they have, we get a different kind of feedback. How does the fact that UAF's aren't all theory and no substance, get into the system? At Michigan, I think we have responded to agency requests in terms of their needs and not in terms of our theoretical concept of what they should be needing. I saw some really strong potentials in that. I will grant you that some of the UAF people that I've known and the things that they are into are highly theoretical, but there is need for that, too, as part of developing approaches. If Michigan needed something like that, we ought to be able to access it through the other UAF's in our region or elsewhere.

Just coordinating our collective strengths is an awesome task. I was thinking of our UAF's, Councils, State Agencies and Advocates building a service system like the four wheels of a car. Hopefully, we can get all the wheels moving down the road in the same direction. I'm excited about the opportunity and I'm looking forward to tomorrow and the discussions and sharing. Our Institute is particularly susceptible right now to new directions, new charges, and new challenges to bring us even more directly into impacting in the care provider system. We can all learn from each other.

Richard Miller:

I think the general feeling that I have, at this point, is that training is being perceived as a panacea to resolve a fairly complex and complicated problem. Even very narrowly defined simple problems are not easily resolved by training intervention. I would suggest that the solution to a fairly complex problem like this is going to be found to have a training component. In addition, it is also going to have an administrative component that will be essential in order for the solution to take place. Needs assessment is not a simple process, but a very complicated one . It gets a lot of people involved. That's a key to the whole thing. It's their program, it's their solution and they have to feel as though they had some input into the eventual evolution of what you're going to do

and the solution. They have to "buy in" so to speak. Tom's .45 caliber diagram and the nine-step method that I made reference to as a needs assessment tool, are similar. Those are some processes. They are all directed at getting the staff involved. One of the most powerful tools available to resolving problems is asking yourself the question "What does the line organization have at their disposal right now in order to resolve some of the very major problems that they have?" They don't need training in a lot of cases. They can resolve those problems simply by balancing the consequences of their action on the job. Tom made reference to penalties and rewards. You can refer to that as driving forces and the restraining forces also. I would add as a kind of a parenthetical note from our experience; don't add anything to a system, i.e., don't add more penalties or don't add rewards. From our experience, subtract things from the system. Whenever you add things, the forces of evil will add something to countermand it. If you're doing something right, and there are penalties for doing it right, remove the penalties. If you're doing something wrong, and there are rewards for doing it wrong, remove the rewards. Also removing something from a system is a way to get things moving.

Assessment, whether it's of needs, training, or any other kind, is by nature a comprehensive process. I think that you've got to involve a comprehensive process to impact on this particular problem or related type problems.

Planning as a process was just touched on during this session. I would like to put in a plug that I don't think that the subject of how to plan has been treated well at this particular session. I would like to recommend that we take a proactive stance in planning rather than a re ctive one.

Too many times we sit down and start building plans around creating objectives for solving problems that we have now rather than taking a more proactive stance. Let's make sure that all the bases are covered on problems. Let's try to avoid the evolution of creating new problems during the whole process. I think in the development of this plan, it is essential to get into defining roles, responsibilities and accountability. It is important to develop a good scenario around the barriers that exist to the performance and try to reduce those barriers. I heard us begin to get into that today. That really is going to have a big payoff. I think when you go back into some of the agencies that you're involved with, such as I'm representing here today, your problem may not be perceived as the most significant problem to them. You may feel a little bit concerned that here you're trying to alter the course of something and the responsiveness on the other end isn't really that big. I would say keep your time and attention focused on your problem and on your project. Don't be discouraged. You can make things happen.

Eugene Guido:

I was a little mystified, you might say, when I got the document that John Zang passed out (Appendix C). It led off with an evaluation of the law, with different interpretations of it. It amazes me that somebody hasn't used the Attorney General of the state or the Attorney General of the United States to form some opinions as to what that law means, at least

for the direction of a group like this. I saw in that document a number of different ways you might interpret it. If you people are befuddled by what that law means, where the heck do you think we are as the rank and file persons delivering the services? Further than that, the gut issues as far as we're concerned, and I hope that's what I'm hearing here today, is your concern about training methods and procedures that are new and are coming to bear in areas that are badly needed.

Our union members are confronted on a daily basis with situations that they're not trained for at all. I had it put to me very bluntly in one instance. A union member said, "If I'm attacked or threatened with attack, what am I supposed to do? Go into a corner and protect myself by just cowering, so to speak, or am I supposed to defend myself by striking back? If you do, you're charged with abuse, you're fired, you're penalized in some manner." That question needs to be dealt with as a training issue, at least as far as we're concerned, but I don't know if you people feel the same way.

Another concern we have is job security. With the trend of taking people out of institutions, our people just aren't staying on staff in those places. You're not attracting the kind of people you should be attracting to those kind of places to begin with, it's just not an attractive place to work at all.

I don't agree with everything that was said here today, but of course, I'm not going to get into the methods of training and all of that business because that's your cup of tea. That's about what I got out of the session here today.

Ray Ramirez:

It started out today with Gene talking about seven lines that brought us here in terms of looking at this particular section of this piece of legislation. One of the interesting things about this particular piece of legislation is that it does bring together a number of different groups of people, councils, the UAF system, state agencies, public employees as well as private employees, and then perhaps most importantly, the consumer, the people that we're actually training or serving.

It seems to me that this particular program doesn't have many of the things we talked about in terms of clout or the ability to mandate certain directions. As a matter of fact, this particular program really brings with it some natural tensions among these bodies. I think this is a very positive thing. In a sense, as long as these tensions are there, and are dealt with on a day-to-day or month-to-month basis, you're going to see progress -- you're going to see movement. It's not always going to be the direction that the council may want, it may not always be in the direction the UAF wants or the public employees, but there's going to be movement. I think that movement is going to be based upon some levels of negotiation and some levels of agreement.

This conference has been valuable to me so far for a number of reasons, one of which is the look we had today at assessment and planning for staff training, at the complexity of what that can mean. When we

examine the strategies and techniques suggested by Dick, Tom and others today, I think we begin to realize that we're really talking about a very high level, very complex system.

We can approach developing such a system based upon dealing with people at different levels in terms of service delivery -- the administrators, the very highly skilled technicians, physicians, psychologists, other people at that level, as well as the people who actually do direct care. It brings, at least to my mind, the real necessity that before we get into actually implementing some of these steps, we better take a look at this picture and put it into focus. We better determine what it is we're trying to accomplish, and then prioritize it so we can agree on which elements in this complex system need addressing first.

III. PROCESS OUTCOMES

Section III includes summaries of the two small-group discussion sessions held on the second day. In the first session, participants were divided into groups by single function, i.e., State Council representatives, State Agency and Union representatives and UAP representatives.

The strategy here was to give Conference participants with similar functions and responsibilities an opportunity to exchange data, opinions, and to explore future actions as effected by Section 511.

After discussing and reporting on their parochial interests, they were re-grouped by mixed function. Individuals were assigned to specific discussion groups to provide a mix of both function and states within each group.

The mixed groups then explored ways and means to cooperatively implement the new legislation and attain mutual goals related to Section 511.

The training experts, who contributed input on the first day, served as resource persons and consultants to the group discussions on the second day.

A. GROUP DISCUSSION BY SINGLE FUNCTION

1. State Council Summary

The group representing State Councils acknowledged their confusion and concern with the legislation prior to Mr. McNeil's presentation the first day of the conference. They reported that they now saw their role as that of influencing and establishing policy to implement Section 511 rather than viewing the council as the responsible agent for conducting a state-wide personnel skills assessment within the care provider system for the developmentally disabled.

From the State Council viewpoint, the new legislation mandated them to co-ordinate a staff development program, beginning with assessment of personnel skills. Barriers included the low visibility of the State Council as a "power" source. Many agencies and state department personnel look on the State DD Council as a limited funding source and/or have little understanding of the Council's function.

2. State Agency Summary

The State Agency group viewed the new legislation as one that was well intentioned, but extremely complex to implement. Since the term "assessment" suggests a measurement to meet some standard or criteria, the mandate for a skills assessment in Section 511 can't be implemented until a needs assessment is carried out. Section 511 gives state agencies a challenge and opportunity to integrate tighter planning into their state level operations. The barriers to implementation range from lack of a

co-operative inter-agency program to lack of hard data, low priority given to staff development and civil service or union policy regarding employment and separation procedures.

3. UAP Summary

The discussants under the banner of University Affiliated Programs appraised Section 511 as an excellent opportunity for them to work more closely with the State Councils. They saw their role as important technical assistance in short and long term planning on staffing/training issues. The hurdle that UAP's face is their present image among may councils and state agencies as theoreticans rather than practical problem-solvers.

The UAP's recognize that weaknesses and strengths within the labor pool currently serving the developmentally disabled can have far reaching impact on their curricula and enrollment levels in pre-service program. The UAP's also acknowledged their image as an in-service training resource could be improved and they have been accused of not responding quickly enough to requests for technical assistance from councils, agencies, and other elements within the care provider system.

4. Summary

Following the group reports, general comments were exchanged. The Conference members synthesized the group reports into (1) a need for closer co-operation, (2) greater communication between all the links in the care provider system and, (3) a need to review current assessment and evaluation systems being used within the state (or anywhere) as a model for wider utilization.

B. GROUP DISCUSSION BY MIXED FUNCTION; REPORTS

In the afternoon of Conference Day #2, participants were re-grouped into three discussion teams. The task was to develop some strategies to answer the question, "In terms of the legislation, how can we respond in a coordinated effective way?" The edited reports of the three afternoon discussion groups are reported on the following pages followed by the Reaction Panel response, selected participant comments and closing remarks.

Group #1

Group #1 in the afternoon session chose to present a series of three brief reports on different strategies rather than a consensus summary.

John Zang:

A first step in addressing new Section 511 of Public Law 95-602 can be the creation of a State Council Task Force to develop an overall planning strategy for getting the implementation process underway. The Council Task Force can utilize the expertise of the UAP's and any technical assistance projects, such as the one hosting this conference, to work up an operational model of action steps.

One of the first things the Council Task Force can do is work with state agencies to arrive at definitions for paraprofessional and professional providers within the system. They can develop a six step recommendation to the Council that would (1) establish priority services that "must be" assessed as soon as time and resources permit, (2) collect plans related to staff training and assessment that might be used as models, (3) work with the Council to draft criteria for assessments, (4) participate in a Regional Council Meeting to exchange strategies and criteria plans, (5) meet with state agencies to disseminate assessment standards and influence key state service agencies to act, and (6) establish regular meetings with key state agency training officers to review plans and progress. The Council Task Force would report to the Council on a regular basis about its activities.

Jerry Adams:

The task I was asked to do was to take the perspective of an Executive Director of a State D.D. Planning Council and say how I would approach Section 511 of P.L. 95-602. However, for me it makes a little more sense to respond as an observer of the activities of the State D.D. Planning Councils and their legislative mandate. Some of the ideas presented here came from our group rather than from me.

It seems to me that it would be a mistake for Councils to make 511 a goal to meet. Rather, 511 should be seen as a method among many that have to be addressed to improve services across agency and program lines.

The Council's role is to help improve services via planning, evaluation, and influencing activities. There can be a large difference in how 511 is approached if it is seen as a goal as opposed to a step in a larger process. For example, if the goal is to develop a set of plans, all that may be necessary is to hire a technician to meet with some key individuals and write up the plans based on their comments. On the other hand, if the goal is to improve services, then a great deal of work would be necessary prior to and following the plan development.

Individuals who have studied human services integration and interagency cooperation, such as Edward Bamheier and Alfred Neufeldt, have concluded that mutual understanding of goals and philosophies is a definite prerequisite to successful interagency successes.

For example, it would be important to know each agency's legal mandate for training, planning, and service; it would also be helpful for each to know the annual (or biannual, etc.) priorities and objectives for each agency, and it would be good if each agency understood how its mandate, resources, and priorities could supplement the mission of each of the others in the areas related to one or two service priorities identified by the Councils.

It is not likely that one individual in a particular agency would have the time to keep up with so much information from all of the agencies serving the developmentally disabled. However, it seems reasonable that a staff member could maintain an understanding of one or two of the

agencies. If several staff divided the work load, as suggested by Baumheier, then at least the most critical agencies might be covered.

Once the nature of the shared mission is clearly understood by any pair of agencies, then gaps in services could be discussed. Significant gaps in the sufficiency of services provided by them in the areas identified as a top priority by the Council would need to be identified. Getting this to occur presumes a rather high level of trust established partly through a good mutual understanding of missions, objectives, priorities, limitations, etc. so that a gap revealed by one would not be assumed to be caused by negligence of the other. In fact, attention would need to be focused on the alternative causes and solutions for each gap. Gaps that were identified as requiring training as an important part or prerequisite to a solution would need to be singled out for further examination.

The next step would be to identify potential providers of training so that they could be involved in the planning process for this training problem. It would also be helpful to identify, perhaps through the potential trainers, data and assessment procedures that might help in the planning process. Service providers, potential trainers, and Council staff could develop an assessment plan for training needed to help reduce the priority service gaps identified by the Council. The Council staff would not necessarily develop the plan, but could be facilitators of the planning process.

After the assessment plan is developed the actual assessment of the adequacy of the skill levels of professionals and paraprofessionals may be conducted by the service providers or the potential trainers. Getting professionals and paraprofessionals to agree to having an assessment of their skill levels may be a very difficult or impossible task and could fill a whole conference with issues to solve. However, assuming that the service providers have the authority to do the assessments, and assuming that the potential trainers have the political and technical skills to do the assessments which are rather large assumptions, then a plan to support training could be generated based on the results from the assessments. Again, Council staff or the Council itself may not be either developing or paying for the development of the plan; rather, their role may be to facilitate the development of the plan by bringing the appropriate people together and helping to organize their time together.

After the plan is developed, training would need to be implemented and, hopefully, service gaps would be reduced in the priority areas identified by the Council. The Council would need to monitor the process all the way to the step of determining if services improved--if, in fact, improvement of services was the goal rather than just to meet the legal mandate in 511.

Arthur Benson:

Section 511 of P.L. 95-602 should be viewed as an opportunity to develop a short and a long term plan for manpower utilization which will link the overall services needs to a responsive manpower training system.

The legislative mandates of the past few years are putting an enormous strain on the human service delivery system. The fragmentation has made a coordinated and comprehensive system difficult to attain. The legislative

mandates cannot be implemented without a planned and coordinated service system coupled to a planned and coordinated manpower utilization and training system.

Approaching skill assessment without a conceptual framework could lead to a system which perpetuates the present inadequacies. If current roles are accepted as adequate, broken down into separate tasks and activities and then assigned to various levels of workers, then there is no opportunity for the system to change and indeed no implied intention to change it.

Sidney Fine of the Upjohn Institute of Employer Research has discussed what he calls the developmental approach which I think has more significance for the planning function of a State Council. The focus of this approach is on the identification of the needs and problems of the clients, their families and their communities. These are then described. The planners then determine the tasks and activities required to meet those needs. They do this without regard for who now carries out the tasks or whether anybody is carrying them out. Finally, described activities are grouped logically and then assigned to various levels of workers. One may then compare the skills available in the current system with those needed as a result of the above analysis. Using a framework, such as the manpower utilization levels described by Allan Roeher in the Canadian National Mental Retardation Manpower Model, you could then (a) describe the overall training needs for a region, county or state, (b) identify immediate needs and long term needs; Some jobs require advanced training, others do not, (c) refine a long term manpower utilization and training plan involving service and training institutions and consumers and (d) provide legislators with descriptive and quantitative information. Such information could be presented in terms of known available fiscal resources as well as in terms of what's desirable.

To the Council Executive Director, the developmental approach has significance because it can provide a utilization pattern and an educational/training pattern around which service agencies can meet and plan together. It is vital that career ladders be available not only to the professional as they are now, but also to the non-degreed person.

However, the step-by-step approach must be planned. The issues are complex and the groups concerned with the issues are many and quite often protective of the status quo. I anticipate that the immediate demand will be to focus on the direct care workers and their short term training needs. It is estimated that 80% of the human service workers do not require advanced training. These skill needs, using the concept of manpower utilization at different descriptive levels, will reflect future service directions as well as current.

In tandem with the implementation of a developmental approach, it would be wise to co-ordinate seven other action steps.

One, seek the support of key Council members who have understanding, influence and vision. Look to them to support acceptance of the developmental plan by Council.

Two, identify potential barriers to the implementation of any plan and and see that strategies for tackling these barriers are developed. Such

barriers may include: professional licensure and self interest, failure to involve the 'right' constituency, lack of understanding by legislators, academic separation of personnel by degree instead of skill, and so on.

Three, approach directly or through influencial Council and/or community people those individuals in organizations critical to any successful service/training and manpower utilization system.

Four, maintain a small representative task force to assist in the step-by-step development and implementation of the plan. Choose a chairperson able to get action and agreement out of strong individuals.

Five, organize with support of the task force an advisory group, perhaps a consortium eventually, of concerned agencies. Make sure this group is kept informed. Bring members on to the taskforce to assist with short term issues.

Six, consider the development of a pilot or demonstration program in an area of the state which has the representative elements for a service training system. For example these elements could be: a state institution, a UAP, a local union, community colleges, group homes, volunteer servie agencies. Develop a consortium for this purpose.

Seven, develop a plan to provide legislators with information designed to create a better understanding of service needs and the accompanying manpower needs. Encourage all legislation creating service demands to also provide support for manpower development.

I believe a coordinated service/training plan is needed if the present legislative mandates are to be met. It's imperative, however, to pay attention to the sources of influence and power whose support is essential if the plan is to be implemented. Current manpower utilization models can provide a framework for responding to Section 511. If we respond to the literal words of the Section, I believe it will not lead to success.

Group Two (Ray Ramirez)

In Group Two, we pursued strategies centered around who needs to be involved, information on who the players are, and the benefits that the players get from making Section 511 implementation a high priority.

It's the feeling of our group that the development of an overall strategy is critical to resolving the implementation process. Since the State DD Council is mandated to carry out the process, under their auspices, a small committee should be appointed to carry out the development of background materials for implementation.

The special committee, or task force, should focus on identifying the key decision makers and policy makers in the important segments of the care provider system. For example, state agencies, unions, certification groups, consumer/advocate groups, DD Councils, educational agencies, UAP's, and service providers.

The committee would then be responsible for identifying the benefits or motivation factors that would enlist the support of the target influencers.

UAP's might be approached to support and work with the State Council based on their desire to improve their pre-service training programs and expand their opportunities to develop marketable in-service programs. The UAP's can be wooed based on improving their image in the community as responsive and action oriented to the public need. They can also be attracted by the possibilities of opening new research challenges and funding opportunities.

State agencies can be contacted and their support won over by perhaps appealing to the ego. The department or bureau chief can be sold on building up his status as a leader and winning recognition within the state for his position on the subject. It can be pointed out that a more efficient use of manpower means better utilization of resources and perhaps enable other "pet" projects of key people to be addressed through participation in the 511 implementation activities

Support from influencial D.D. Council members can be won through appeal to benefits of the program resulting in more efficient use of dollars and people resources, as well as improved quality of services.

It's generally agreed among our group that the key to success lies in the identification of the power base within each state system and devising effective ways to tap it.

Group Three (Paul Shankland)

Our discussion yielded the following recommendations for the role of the Council. It was felt that the Developmental Disabilities State Councils should decide what is to be assessed within the Council's established priorities. It was felt it was also appropriate for the Council to set a general strategy on how to go about assessing skills and training programs. This should be carried out with consultation from labor, from management, and with client representation. This consultation can take various forms in the different states. For instance, in some states client representation can be accomplished well by Protection and Advocacy while in others it may better be accomplished by voluntary associations.

Beyond assessment, it was felt that the Council could also identify resources for training at the level of coordination of training among state agencies. This correlates well with the coordinative function of the Councils. They should be able to, as a result of the assessment, identify training resources within varying state departments; private agencies and other aspects of the service delivery system that can be shared across different facets of the system, thereby reducing duplication and "reinvention of the wheel."

It was felt that the state agency's role has two main aspects; the first, providing the base line data for determining what to assess and what strategies may be used for assessment. Second, the state agencies are the

logical ones to perform the actual assessment. It was noted that this needs to be done from the top down so that management skills, as well as hands-on skills, are assessed. It's also recommended that the State Personnel Divisions or Departments not be neglected in this process because they could offer resources in these processes. The management skills assessment need was emphasized as a need because there was a strong feeling on the part of many people that hands-on skills training often exceeds the support and motivation that emanates from the management system, resulting in ineffective service delivery that people are often tempted to try and remedy through further training.

It was felt that the U.A.P. could best carry out its role by continuing to relate to its training mandate and function as a resource (along with the others) to State Councils on training related issues. It was felt that the U.A.P. could provide technical assistance in planning for the process using their experience with training issues to aid the Council in making well informed decisions about assessment strategies which will serve the delivery systems as well as comply with the requirements of Section 511.

The group was also involved in a discussion of the role of the union in the process. It was felt that the unions now have an opportunity to be proactive in being supportive and making recommendations about the assessment of skills and the development of training programs. They can forestall many future difficulties and negotiations problems. In the past, the unions have been in the position of reacting to difficult situations that sometimes develop from employees facing unrealistic expectations that result from inadequate training.

Union involvement in this assessment process will also enable them to assure that state administrations and DD Councils continue to be aware that as they ask employees to train for and carry out greater responsibilities that there are responsibilities on them as employers to respond to the increasing needs of the employees.

It was suggested that unions seek membership on Developmental Disabilities Councils although the group did not go into the details of how the Governors would go about deciding which unions or union representatives might be appointed to the Councils.

C. PANEL REACTION TO GROUP DISCUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Gene Handley: Introduction

We have covered a great deal of content in these two days and have discussed a number of strategies related to the implementation of Section 511. Our reaction panel will now be asked to reflect on the past two days from their individual perspectives.

Julie Cohen:

I would have to say that in preparing my summary notes, I was heavily influenced by the organization that the group I was in went through. The

sequencing of it came very much from our second discussion group. There seems to be a certain number of issues that we have to address. The first one comes under the heading of "identifying." There seem to be a great number of subparts to that; identifying the actors and the actors are not only the people, but the actor's systems. The systems are the service agencies or the groups made up of the actors. We must identify the information on those individuals or units, what makes them tick, where do they get their M&M's, what kinds of pressures are they responsive to, and what kinds of approaches would pay off for them. Then, still in terms of identifying, identifying the specific people that we want to work with. I heard great arguments starting at one end that the action movers in the agency might be at some secondary level in the agency and we might do better identifying them than trying to work through the top of the system and bring pressure down. I mentioned identifying the benefits, but it can be a barrier that there are no mandated kinds of interactions, and yet one of the positive aspects may be that by identifying the benefits for better agency interaction you can build bridges to develop relationships and move programs. The last aspect I have of identification is of the resources. It includes the people resources, the dollar resources, and other resources. It translates into much more than just funds. As I listened to the second group reporting earlier, I was thinking that one of the resources that can be of great profit for us is the union resource. Here is a set of people with a particular orientation who are here today and have been drawn into this discussion as a proactive rather than reactive step. It fit in well with where I was looking at resources.

The need to go through the identification process is the first part of an action plan. The second aspect, in terms of implementation, is the development approach, a "planned approach". The best way seems to be agreement that the responsibility in Section 511 law is with the Council. How does that get implemented? What is the strongest strategy? How do activities, such as this conference, get built upon so that there is opportunity at a later point to draw on our common shared experiences?

Then finally there's the aspect of "selling." Somebody said the Council's role is to sell this. That may be. There may also be some of those "actors" we spoke of earlier who could be good sales people too because something they're trying to do could be really helped by something that we want done. There's need for strategy around how we present this to the people in terms of their self interest. That becomes important.

The next step is the "communication link". I think this kind of conference is a good example of one level of setting up communication links. I could see links within states, the same cluster of people, but state by state. I can see the same links within the systems as the councils across the region or the UAF's around this conference. There are different ways of structuring, and eventually you end up with the network. It's sort of like that Ma Bell Telephone switchboard that they show in their advertising. You can go a lot of different ways to get from here to there and they facilitate that by coordinating different pathways. That facilitory kind of communication plays an important part in the eventual implementation.

My final comment is that the product that generates out of the activities here may be six very different products tailored to six very different states, and yet some of the processes, some of the actors, some of the efforts along the way would be very much the same, state-by-state.

Ray Rameriz:

I would like to begin by discussing first the meeting itself in general and the people that were brought here. My first reaction is that this has been a very positive and learning experience for me, from a number of points of view. First of all, I think that there has been a sharing of some new resources and new potential sources that we have not seen before, both in terms of what we learned from the state personnel offices, from the unions, from the federal government, as well as effectively using consultants in this particular process. One thing I have some concerns about is that Minnesota and Wisconsin planning councils were not here.

On an overall basis, I would say that one of the things I was impressed with was that there was a meeting being held on strategies to develop and implement a section of this particular piece of legislation that we're engaged in. I wanted to come and hear and be a part of that and discuss it. As I said, I found we learned a lot of things with new resources. I think that as a step, in terms of further direction, I think that each council has a lot of its own work to do. I think that many of the strategies outlined by the various workers are very similar in terms of direction and goals and movement that they would use. I think there are also some things that need to happen at the regional level. They could be assisted by the regional office or by a regional technical assistance group, which UAF's have always had, but councils have not. In a sense, you see the benefit today of having some assistance at the regional level which brings together a group. Essentially this has been a meeting which has been directed at UAF's. In addition to UAF's in attendance, we have councils, we have other individuals, but it's been directed at helping UAF's in terms of their strategies toward moving and assistance of implementing 511. I think that's been very beneficial. I think that the same kind of thing with regional councils would also be an effective mechanism.

Emilio Guido:

Today's session was much more illuminating for me than yesterday. As indicated, we got into quite a discussion as to the union's role and maybe there are some misconceptions of what the union is to begin with. Generally speaking, the union is a reacting agency to an action by the employer or his designated agents. It's been felt that since AFSCME, for example, has most of the public employees involved, we shouldn't have recognition in the job planning process in the individual states. We have no input. We have no members in your organization and we have no input in anything that goes down. Where we do, where we have labor contracts, we react to management actions. It was suggested, and I think it was an excellent suggestion, that we ought to be about getting representation on the DD Councils. I'm going to look into that very definitely. If I learned nothing else, I think that's a good point and I think we ought to be involved in that. The role of the union in 511, as far as I could see,

was the part that talked about the maintenance of the employee wages and fringe benefits. There should be guarantees of employment when they implement deinstitutionalization. There should be no loss of jobs for those employees. Efforts should be made to guarantee the employment of such employees. I thought also that for better delivery of services we should talk to the people and find out what they want to do. It ought to be an assessment of what should be done as opposed to what is being done.

I don't know if this next subject has been addressed to any large degree. The subject of responsibility of enforcement of decisions once they're made, who does it lie with? In today's sessions, it came out that the DD Council should be responsible for that, but in many instances they don't have the wherewithal. As I understand, DD councils are appointed by the governor and the ultimate responsibility lies there. I think that's where it has to go, to the governor. I don't think it can go anywhere else. Beyond that, overall, the sessions were good. It's going to cause some action, hopefully, some in our organizations that you may see in the immediate future.

Richard Miller:

In general, I feel that we have been treated to a very fine, well orchestrated session and I think that the two principals at the front table should receive our praise and acollades for that.

Getting down to some of the reactions and some of the things that weren't covered, I think that there was an emphasis on training and I think that that was the reason why we were here discussing assessing competencies. There obviously is another relationship going on somewhere else where they're probably considering the larger picture. I would echo some of the sentiments of Julie that there are linkages that are required; you just can't take these things singularly as they are composed right now and treat them in a vacuum. There are linkages which are absolutely essential between this effort and overall change that you are trying to bring about.

I have seen a lot of training events and a lot of training activity when training was principally the only activity that was going on. In general, training, when it's done all by itself doesn't accomplish anything at all. I think that there are other competitive activities and partnership activities that have to be identified, and should be identified, so that they move along as quickly as training moves along. The training technology, the technology of how to to assess training needs, is so well established that they could tear along at a very fast rate. They could accomplish that objective very quickly. However all the other things that have to happen, and should happen at the same time, may not move along quite as well without identifying, and in some way enunciating, that those activities must occur at the right time in the whole process. So, I would charge all of the councils with the responsibility of identifying those activities. They have to occur at the same time so that the training will have some impact; without those other activities, training would have no impact--that's predictable. There should be some guidance from the councils, or from some body of people such as this group, to create a more comprehensive assessment of all the things that should be done in order to

reach the desired results. For example, guidelines or definitions of a more comprehensive approach to planning and what is involved in the planning process itself. I think we all have elements of what will go into the planning, but not the planning process itself. Guidance is needed so that people will get on the same track of identifying the missions, goals and objectives that are required in the 511 process. I'm not suggesting that the councils establish a total comprehensive planning process at the beginning; what I would like to see them do is create a skeleton of what their planning would be, bounce that off some regional group, and then get some kind of general agreement before they flesh it out and move into a more comprehensive one.

I think we discussed very nicely the roles, responsibilities and the accountability of the councils and the UAF's and some of the other ingredients involved here. I think that selling 511 is a most critical issue and should not be understated. There is no doubt that we are enthused, but you might find out that some of the agencies which are very essential to the success, such as mental health agencies, have competitive problems going on. Either the media, or legislative related activities can inspire their enthusiasm in different directions than 511. I think that there has to be a fairly sophisticated, fairly comprehensive selling job done and that shouldn't be underestimated. I think that we did accomplish the objective at this conference of creating some guidance in a variety of skills assessment alternatives and options that people have. I would suggest that, in general, the councils focus on providing guidance as to how this job has to be done, rather than providing rules, regulations and policies as to how it will be done. I would caution you that you are down to a two variable system--you have methods and you have results. If you try to specify both the results that you want and how people will arrive at those results you are overspecifying that system. You won't get the results that you want, or people are going to deviate from those methods, and they will be very creative about doing that. So, put the emphasis on the results that are required from 511 and allow people to do their thing.

D. Selected Comments from Participants: Reaction to Panel, Day #2

Ron Kozlowski:

Certain state councils are at different levels than other councils in terms of doing or performing some of these training process functions at the present time. A conference like this is going to assist us in the sense of reassessing where we are, but implementing those kinds of things has to be done at the state level. There are some things that could take place at the regional level. Among those things would be for councils to meet and assess essentially the entire legislation, as well as 511, in terms of how it relates to the delivery of services. In a sense, develop strategies for councils to work towards implementing the entire piece of legislation. Nationally, these kind of things could be carried a step further. I think what would have been most helpful would have been the publication of the rules and regulations at the time they were due six months after the legislation. Then we would all be in a clearer position, not only in terms of 511, but the total piece of legislation. Those kind of things really inhibit. I'm sure it effects some of the regional things

that could take place, as well as some of the things that need to take place, in each state.

Mike Tracy:

One of the obvious problems we have in this particular field is one which is probably not different from some of the other human service fields. A direct care provider in Illinois might be called the direct service paraprofessional; Michigan might call them something a little bit different, and so on, but if we really analyze the performances or tasks they are doing, they are really very similar. I would think that a generic skills assessment is viable.

Paul Shankland:

I think it's crucial to realize that in super organizational efforts, and by super I don't mean superb or excellent, but rather umbrella organizational efforts, many errors are made because of large groups that purport to represent a large number of a population. A regional advisory group, like that proposed, is one where there are potentially quite a number of errors that can be made, a lot of traps. I would suggest very strongly, that at least in the initial stages, as a result of this conference, we ought to facilitate the grass roots and go all the way up the line with input and ownership. Every single federal effort and state and local effort that I've seen that's failed has ignored the actors, ignored the ownership and selling aspects. They said we have mandated it, so it will be done. I think human beings are the most complex systems in the universe. And we will find a way to subvert anything if we do not see we have a piece of the action, if we have not taken back that little proposed project and at least had a chance to chew on it. I think we need to realize that. I'm suggesting that probably the next step ought to be some kind of regional coordination effort, but only that. This effort ought to be in terms of facilitating and building of ownership into the system. It's a lot of work, a tremendous lot of work, but I think the end product which you may not see for a year, will be something that literally the people will be very hard pressed to tear down. So I'm questioning the regional body on this, and I'm also suggesting that the opportunity be made for structuring the inputs right up the line. I think the communication is critical here in terms of moving the products up the line. I think you need to have some people who are really astute in terms of knowing the system as well as process type people, who know organization, who know what things make a program click. Give them each a body of different actors, that basically have respect for each other, but who don't already have fixed solution and coordinate their efforts.

Ben Berman:

I think one of the things that I hear coming from the discussions today is that because of the tremendous diversity of the various agencies, until each of the elements sees their own self-interest involved, it's going to be difficult to achieve some of the things we want. Our situation is like that of the fellow who was the worst soldier in the army. He failed miserably at everything and the top brass didn't know what to do with him. Finally, they called in this one officer and said, "Look we have

Private Smith and he is the worst soldier. Nobody can do anything with him. We keep transferring him from unit to unit, but he just keeps goofing off all of the time. We've had it with him! This is the last chance. See if you can do anything with him, if not we'll court martial him and kick him out of the army." Low and behold in 24 hours, Private Smith is up for the congressional medal of honor! He's become the number one hero of the armed forces! Well, the generals can't believe it! So they call in the lieutenant and they say, "Lieutenant, what is this? We're putting you up for captain because you turned this man completely around in 24 hours. Smith is our number one hero. How did you do it?" And the lieutenant replied, "It's very simple--I handed him a gun and said, 'You're in business for yourself!' So, I think if we can, in a sense, encourage ownership and investment by the agencies and organizations in doing skills assessment, then we'll be able to implement the mandate. Through the State DD Councils, with perhaps assistance from the UAF's, we have to sell the care providers that they have something to gain. Then I think we will be able to move forward with some of these assessments and evaluations. We may not like it, but people are asking us to be accountable for what we are doing. They want us to be able to generate data and defend what we are doing in ways other than saying we are helping a lot of people. They want quantification and they want quality. And our dollars are tied to it. So we have to begin to look at ways to generate that hard data. I think we can do it with some of the strategies that we kicked around during these two days and some of the communication links that we established.

Concluding Statement: Gene Handley

In closing, I would like to comment, not on the content of the meeting, but on the process and the people involved. Regarding the process, we believed that the meeting should take the form of a consultation/conference, which is really an attempt to provide a consultative environment. We hoped that you would interact and confer with one another as you had access to consultants and as you assumed the role of consultant to others who were here. I saw that happening; I hope you experienced it yourself. I hope that this consultation conference gave you an opportunity to say and to do some of the things that will leave a positive memory worthy of two days of effort.

Regarding the process, it doesn't end today. For you, it continues when you return to your agencies and organizations to consider some of the options and ideas discussed at this conference. For us, we would hope that we can continue to be helpful to you through the grant that formed this conference. It charges us with the responsibility to follow up and we will be doing that in two ways. First, to develop proceedings, a document in which we'll try to summarize the positions represented at this meeting. We have audiotaped all of the sessions and we will be making future decisions as to how to use those as well. Second, we will be surveying each of you in a few months regarding the impact this meeting has had. What steps have been taken? What's happened in your state? What do you suggest be done next? What would you like to communicate back to those who were here and those who were not here? We look forward to your continued participation with us and thank you for your valued contribution to this program.

IV. Summary of Recommendations

At the conclusion of the two days, there appeared to be consensus among the Conference participants on the following points:

A. Implementation Responsibilities

1. The role of the State DD Councils will be that of developing a comprehensive plan for and encouraging agency participation in the skills assessment of personnel serving the developmentally disabled and evaluating the impact of training on the care provider system.

2. The actual mechanics of assessment are best handled by the individual state agencies and other provider units in the system. University Affiliated Program staff may be a valuable resource in the design, administration, monitoring and evaluation of the assessment.

B. State DD Council: Action Steps

The first step should be the appointment of a small committee or Task Force to develop recommendations for council action in the areas of skill assessment and the evaluation of training. Members of the Task Force should be selected from key provider agencies (e.g., education, social services, mental health, public health, vocational rehabilitation), union and UAP representatives.

In addition, technical assistance personnel, including private training/manpower development consultants, may be utilized by the Task Force. They can be employed for short periods as members of the Task Force when required.

C. Task Force: Short Term Goals

In the development of its recommendations, the Task Force might do the following:

1. Identify priority services for assessment based upon state need;

2. Identify key decision and policy makers in priority services who might be invited to participate in this process. Identify "influencers" in the system in all service areas to establish a power base as part of the implementation process;

3. Identify training resources (experts/facilities), including State Personnel Division or Department and the Office of Leadership Development (U.S. Civil Service);

4. Collect preliminary data on existing assessment and evaluation strategies as models to share with Council and Agency Administration;

5. Assign each member of the Task Force responsibility to obtain data from at least one priority service unit in the system. Data can include (1) goals/objectives, (2) legal mandates related to training, and (3) attitudes toward training; and

6. Develop a report of recommendations to the Council including purpose, goals and action steps for implementation of recommendations. The recommendations will become part of the state Plan and may suggest the continuation of the Task Force as a permanent committee on "Training and Manpower."

D. Council and Training and ManPower Committee: Long Term Goals

As the deinstitutionalization process continues, service requirements and support systems must undergo rapid change. Manpower development priorities based on the changing service needs will require an ongoing personnel assessment/evaluation cycle. A more proactive policy is required and might include the following elements:

1. Systematic needs assessment of clients, families and communities which lead to improved determinations of manpower and personnel training needs;

2. Professional task analysis and job designs based on quality care requirements; and

3. Development of a meaningful Manpower Career Ladder to attract personnel to the field and retain them in the system.

APPENDIX A

REGION V CONSULTATION/CONFERENCE
"DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES PROFESSIONAL/PARAPROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL:
SKILL ASSESSMENT AND TRAINING

FINAL AGENDA

Wednesday, June 27		
8-10:00	Informal Reception at Hotel	G. Handley
Thursday, June 28		
8:30	Opening Remarks and Introductions	G. Handley
8:45	Welcome	R. Vogt R. Kozlowski
9:00	Section 511 - Content and Intent	R. McNeil
9:45	Questions and Answers	
10:00	Coffee	
10:15	Current Efforts in Training and Skill Assessment	M. Montmerlo
11:00	Professional Association Perspective	R. Scheerenberger
12:00	Lunch - "System Management Perspective"	R. Miller
1:15	Region V Efforts to Date:	
	State Council	R. Ramirez
	UAF	A. Benson
	TA Project	G. Handley
2:00	Skill Assessment Strategies	T. Kamlinger
3:00	Reaction Panel:	
	UAF	J. Cohen
	Professional Association	A. Berkowitz
	Paraprofessional Association	E. Guido
	State Council	R. Ramirez
	Systems Management	R. Miller
3:30	Reaction Panel:	
	UAF	J. Cohen
	Professional Association	A. Berkowitz
	Paraprofessional Association	E. Guido
	State Council	R. Ramirez
	Systems Management	R. Miller
5:00	Summary Remarks and Introduction of Tomorrow's Agenda	G. Handley

Friday, June 29

8:30	Opening Remarks	G. Handley
8:40	"Resources and Process"	J. Nava
9:00	Small Groups Discussions By Function	
	1. State Councils 2. State Agencies/Unions 3. University Affiliated Facilities	
12:00	Lunch	
1:00	Reports By Groups	
1:30	Small Group Discussion By Mixed Function	
3:00	Reports By Groups	
3:30	Impact of Strategies/Recommendations: Panel Response	
	UAF	J. Cohen
	Paraprofessional Association	E. Guido
	State Council	R. Ramirez
	Systems Management	R. Miller
4:00	Discussion and Conclusions	
4:15	Closing Remarks and Adjournment	G. Handley

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANTS

Skill Assessment and Training Conference
June 28-29, 1979
Participant List

Mr. Tyler Jackson
Planner
Governor's Planning Council on DD
State of Illinois
222 South College
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Joe Nava
Training Consultant and Associate Director
U.S. Office of Personnel Management
Federal Office Building
29th Floor
230 S. Dearborn
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Ray Ramirez
Executive Director
Governor's Planning Council on DD
222 South College
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Dr. Kenneth Swiatek
Director
Illinois Institute for DD
1640 West Roosevelt
Chicago, Illinois 60608

Cynthia Brantner
Executive Director
DD State Planning Council
Interdepartmental Board for Coordination of
Human Services Programs
State House
Room 117
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Suzanne Sturgeon
Adult Educator
Developmental Training Center
2853 East 10th Street
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Dr. Michael Tracy
Director of Training
Developmental Training Center
2853 East 10th Street
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Julius Cohen
Acting Director
Institute for the Study of Mental Retardation
and Related Disabilities
130 South First Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Dr. Richard Miller
Executive Director, Management and Staff
Development
Michigan Department of Social Services
6545 Mercantile Way
Holiday Plaza, Suite 9
Lansing, Michigan 48910

John Zang
Staff, Michigan State Planning Council for DD
Michigan Department of Mental Health
Lansing, Michigan 48296

Eunice Davis
Director of Child Development Section
St. Paul-Ramsey Hospital
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Dr. Tom Kramlinger
Senior Training Planner
Wilson Learning Corporation
6950 Washington Avenue, South
Eden Prairie, Minnesota 55344

Robert McNeil
Suite 1604
West Bank Building
505 Marquette, N.W.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

Dr. Jerry Adams
Director of Evaluation
Nisonger Center
1500 Cannon Drive
Room 441
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Susan Arnoczky
Staff Development - Program Evaluation
Division of MR and DD
30 East Broad Street
Room 1257
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Arthur Benson
Interdisciplinary Training Program Director
Nisonger Center
1580 Cannon Drive
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Yvonne Fryberger
Coordinator, Development Consultation Team
Cincinnati Center for DD
Elland & Bethesda Avenues
Room 379
Cincinnati, Ohio 45229

Elsie Helsel
Director of Ohio University Affiliated Center
For Human Development
188 Longview Heights Road
Athens, Ohio 45701

Michael Sheets
Staff Development
Rehabilitation Services Commission
4656 Heaton Road
Columbus, Ohio 43229

Anne Stowers
Program Evaluator
Ohio DD Planning Council
30 East Broad Street
Room 1299
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dr. Melvin Montemerlo
Commander
U.S. Army Training Support Center
ATTN: ATTSC-IT (Dr. Melvin Montemerlo)
Fort Eustis, Virginia 23604

Albert J. Berkowitz, Ed.D., FAAMD
Executive Director
American Association for Mental Deficiency
5101 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20016

Silvia Jackson
Training Coordinator
Organizational Development and Training Office
Room 202, Tenney Building
Division of Community Services
110 East Main Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53705

Sue Peckham
Training Specialist
Bureau of DD
1 West Wilson Street
Room 540
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Richard C. Scheerenberger, Ph.D., FAAMD
Director
Central Wisconsin Center for the DD
317 Knutson Drive
Madison, Wisconsin 53704

Paul Shankland
Community Consultant
Indiana Department of Mental Health
Division on MR and DD
5 Indiana Square
Indianapolis, Indiana 46704

Deborah Spitalnik
Temple Center
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Eugene S. Guido, Director
Southfield Area Office
Michigan District Council #25
AFSCME - AFL-CIO
24611 Greenfield Avenue
Southfield, Michigan 48075

Robert Vogt
Director, Developmental Disabilities
HEW Region V
300 Wacker Drive
30th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Ron Kozlowski
Nisonger Center
1580 Cannon Drive
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Bennett H. Berman, Ed.D.
Project Associate
Institute for the Study of Mental Retardation
and Related Disabilities
130 South First Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

E. Eugene Handley, Ph.D.
Project Director
Institute for the Study of Mental Retardation
and Related Disabilities
130 South First Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Phyllis Higman
Administrative Assistant
Institute for the Study of Mental Retardation
and Related Disabilities
130 South First Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

APPENDIX C

MICHIGAN PLAN (DRAFT)

FY 1979-80
MICHIGAN STATE PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

Section VI - Personnel Resource Development

Draft III

June 19, 1979

APPENDIX C

INTRODUCTION

The Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 1978 stipulates that state plans for developmental disabilities must provide for an assessment of the adequacy of the skill level of staff serving the developmentally disabled as well as the adequacy of state plans and programs supporting the training of such staff. Accomplishing this requirement necessitates clarification of at least four factors: (1) the intent of the legislation; (2) the Michigan State Planning Council's position on planning for training (the Council's position has been clarified and is included herein); (3) state plans and programs supporting training; and (4) the State Planning Council's role in assessing the adequacy of skill levels and state plans and programs. This section of the State Plan for Developmental Disabilities reviews each of these factors, identifies specific needs for complete clarification, and concludes with performance goals for achieving clarification and meeting the mandate of the law. The performance goals indicate the State Planning Council's general intent and direction towards assessing the adequacy of skills and state plans and programs during fiscal year 1980.

APPENDIX C

Section 133 (b) (6) (A) as Amended by Section 511 of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act

The Act stipulates that:

> "The [state] plan must provide for--
> "an assessment of the adequacy of the skill level of professionals and paraprofessionals serving persons with developmental disabilities in the State and the adequacy of the State programs and plans supporting training of such professionals and paraprofessionals in maintaining the high quality of services provided to persons with developmental disabilities in the State."

The draft regulations promulgated pursuant to P.L. 95-602 have not provided clarification as to state planning councils' specific responsibilities under this provision. Since it is not anticipated that final rules will provide additional information and because development of reasonable interpretations will be time consuming, the Michigan State Planning Council will begin immediately to interpret the provision.

The following interpretations of the provision's various parts illustrate the provision's vagueness and the need for a careful and thoughtful approach to determining its meaning.

"[state] plans must provide for"

The appropriate interpretation of this phrase is critical because it will determine the State Planning Council's level of involvement in the assessment of skill levels and state plans and programs. This phrase could be interpreted to mean that: (1) state planning councils must actually perform an assessment; (2) state planning councils must include in their state plans a methodology for such an assessment; or (3) state planning councils must include in their state plans an assessment but not necessarily one that is conducted by the state planning council, i.e., performed by various departments and/or agencies responsible for personnel serving the developmentally disabled and the training of such personnel.

"assessment of the adequacy"

This phrase could have the following implications for each target of assessment:

(1) *"skill level"* State planning councils could:

(a) perform task and performance analyses of every professional and paraprofessional serving the developmentally disabled;

(b) examine job descriptions, assume that staff possess the skills required by the job

descriptions, and determine if job descriptions require the adequate skills for serving the developmentally disabled; or

(c) request each agency to assess the adequacy of the skill level of its staff serving the developmentally disabled and provide the state planning council with the results.

(2) *"State programs"* State planning councils could:

(a) identify elements essential to any program providing training to staff serving the developmentally disabled and determine if agencies responsible for training have included such elements in their program(s);

(b) perform evaluations of state training programs; or

(c) use the results of evaluations conducted by those agencies responsible for training staff serving the developmentally disabled.

(3) *"State plans"* State planning councils could:

(a) identify elements essential to any plan supporting the training of staff serving the developmentally disabled and determine if state agencies responsible for training have included such elements in their plans; or

(b) in cooperation with each state agency responsible for training staff serving the developmentally disabled, identify essential plan elements and determine if the plans meet the criteria developed.

"professional" and "paraprofessional"

Functional definitions of these work categories that apply to all state agencies do not exist. State planning councils could:

(1) define the work categories so that they apply to all agencies; or

(2) have each agency which provides services to the developmentally disabled define each term.

In both alternatives, state planning councils could decide that only professionals and paraprofessionals employed as state civil servants would have their skill levels assessed for adequacy.

State planning councils must also decide if agencies which serve the developmentally disabled but have neither training plans nor programs should somehow be included in the assessment process. That is, should state planning councils identify those agencies which <u>should</u> have training plans and/or programs but do not?

The foregoing interpretations of the provision's parts are not intended to be exhaustive but rather to underscore the need for a careful and thoughtful analysis. Certain interpretations, for example, may require far more resources than are available to not only state planning councils but other state agencies as well.

APPENDIX C

Michigan State Planning Council's Position on Planning for Training

The Michigan State Planning Council believes that careful and thorough planning is a prerequisite to successful training programs and that a plan or program document is an integral part of any training effort. The personnel assessment provision of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act is an opportunity for the State Planning Council to assist state departments in developing plans and programs that more effectively provide trained personnel to help meet the needs of the developmentally disabled.

Plans and programs for training staff that serve the developmentally disabled should reflect deliberate decisions regarding goals, objectives, strategies, and evaluation. A complete plan or record of these decisions, however, is sometimes sacrificed because of limited time and resources. Agencies are sometimes inclined to develop strategies or training curricula without documented needs or written objectives. Evaluation of the training effort is then hampered because there is no record of what the curricula were specifically intended to accomplish. Such a sketchy approach to training could lead to costly duplication of ineffective strategies.

The Michigan State Planning Council seeks to do more than simply judge training plans and programs to be adequate or inadequate. Where complete plans or programs do not exist, the Council intends to work with departments to develop a well defined approach to address their training needs. This portion of the Personnel Resource Development Section emphasizes the need for both training plans and training programs and identifies the essential elements of such a plan or program. Together, these elements form a framework for developing criteria to assess the adequacy of training plans and programs during fiscal year 1980.

Alexander Braun recently indicated in the Training and Development Journal that organizations engage in training for three principal reasons:[1] (1) to accommodate to personnel growth and turnover; (2) to prepare employees to perform newly-created duties and responsibilities brought on by changes in organizational objectives, structures, laws, policies, and new technology; and (3) to improve the ability of employees to perform present or future duties more effectively. The extent to which an organization achieves these goals, however, is greatly influenced by the thoroughness of its planning process. For example, the federal government spent approximately $24.5 million in 1976 on short term managerial and supervisory training, yet little or nothing is known about whether the benefits derived were worth the expenditure.[2] Braun has implied that an effective training needs analysis would have greatly assisted the government in determining the benefits of its training programs.[3] However, a training needs analysis is but one essential step in planning for training. The planning process for developing training activities should include, at a minimum, the following steps:

(1) determine needed skills; (2) assess the available skills; (3) determine training needs using the prior two factors; (4) assess available training resources; (5) formulate goals and objectives; (6) develop strategies or standards statements which describe specific performance required to reach each objective; (7) select appropriate teaching strategies; and (8) develop an evaluation system.

An effective training effort, however, not only requires a planning process but also a plan. A plan is basically a reflection of the planning process. It might also be considered a record of the results of decision-making conducted at each step of the planning process. Thus, a plan is a set of decisions regarding goals, objectives, resources, strategies, and evaluation.[4,5]

There are at least three advantages to preparing a plan document:[6]

(1) Providing a guideline. Well-stated plans are an asset to project staff. Knowing the purpose and direction of a project reduces anxiety and facilitates decision-making.

(2) Supplying information. Well-stated plans minimize confusion by communicating project intentions to those not directly involved. Those interested in replicating the project would also find such a plan helpful.

(3) Forming a base for evaluation. Before one can evaluate the success of a program, one must be able to diagnose the presence of a problem and to define goals indicative of progress in ameliorating that condition.[7] A well-stated plan provides goals and objectives or a base for evaluation.

A plan for training should, at a minimum, contain the following components:

(1) results of a performance analysis;
(2) goals;
(3) objectives;
(4) strategies or performance standards for determining when each objective is achieved;
(5) resources (including a budget); and
(6) an evaluation procedure.

The characteristics and significance of each of the plan components are provided below.

(1) Results of a Performance Analysis

Developing valid objectives for a training program requires an assessment of the skills and knowledges required for task

proficiency as well as an assessment of the skills possessed by individual employees.[8] A performance analysis examines the difference between what the employee is capable of doing and what is intended for him/her to be able to do.[9] The difference or gap between actual abilities and performance and the required skills and knowledges for task proficiency provides the necessary information for determining training needs and objectives to meet those needs.

Alexander Braun emphasized the importance of a performance or training needs analysis by contending that the successful application of training depends upon it.[10] "Unless the proposed training serves to meet legitimate organizational and/or personal needs and objectives, training will probably not be implemented and funding allocated to it may be wasted."

The results of the performance or training needs analysis should appear in the plan for training for two principal reasons. First, such information gives credibility to the training objectives. Showing that training needs are based upon a rigorous task analysis and an assessment of what employees are capable of doing gives relevance to the program. Secondly, the inclusion of such results in the plan allows the training needs to be readily referenced as the program is continuously evaluted. Initial evaluation studies may indicate that the program is not addressing the training needs and that objectives and strategies should be modified.

(2) Goals

Goals or goal statements reveal an organization's general interest and direction for meeting demonstrated needs. Frequently, needs statements themselves are used as goals or rephrased and translated into goals.[11] Such general, abstract statements are the first step in a logical progression toward meeting needs. Goal statements are necessary because objectives alone often do not communicate the purpose of such a specific action. For example,[12] in response to a need for cooperating with a newly established advocacy system, a human service agency develops an objective that specifies that within the next six months, agency staff will provide advocates with a background summary of 10 percent of the clients the agency and advocacy system have in common. This objective, however, could be an attempt to reach any one of the following goals:

(1) To increase knowledge and support of the agency's philosophy and programs among the staff of the advocacy system.

(2) To increase mutual knowledge of each other's common goals among agency staff and advocates.

(3) To establish a communication system for ongoing exchange of information among the staff of the agency and the staff of the advocacy system.

Goal statements, then, give relevance to objectives. Without goals, objectives may seem random and confusing.

(3) Objectives

Objectives are those steps necessary to achieve a goal.[13] Objectives are clear and precise statements that indicate both measurable achievements and time limits for reaching them. "They are the most crucial part of the program plan, for if they are well stated they make it possible to ascertain, through various evaluation procedures, whether progress is being made toward goals. . . . A well written objective must be behavioral, outcome oriented, and time linked."[14] Without clearly stated objectives, confusion about program outcomes is inevitable and evaluation is all but impossible.[15,16,17]

(4) Strategies

The next level of detail in a plan is strategies or performance standards. Strategies or performance standards outline the procedures necessary to reach the objectives and describe what will actually be done in a project.[18,19] It is at the strategies level that training curricula, for example, would be described. To be effective, strategies " . . . must specify who will implement the strategy, what procedures or techniques will be used, how they will be implemented and when and where they will be carried out."[20] The specificity that strategies add to the other plan components not only helps administrators, program staff, and others understand the direction of a training program, but also helps the evaluator determine whether or not project objectives and/or strategies need revision to meet client needs.

(5) Resources

The major resources for any training effort are staff, money, materials, space, and time. Although decisions regarding all of these resources are usually reflected in a plan's goals, objectives, strategies, and evaluation procedure, combining such decisions in the form of a budget is useful for internal planning and program implementation and/or management control. A budget can: (1) assure that program objectives can be achieved with a specified amount of dollars; (2) provide program managers an opportunity to monitor expenditures and develop plans for improving operational results; and (3) provide executive management the ability to hold program managers accountable for expenditures and performance achievement.

Regardless of the type (line item, program, or performance), a budget can assist program managers in achieving their goals and objectives in a cost efficient manner.

(6) Evaluation

Simply stated, evaluation tells the program manager if the training program is meeting its objectives and how well the results are meeting the training needs.[21] Evaluation is more than determining success or failure; it is a systematic and continuous part of planning and program implementation.[22,23,24] Rose indicates that there are three essential phases in evaluating a training program:[25] (1) evaluation of the training plan; (2) evaluation of the process of instruction, including periodic evaluation of instructor performance and student achievement; and (3) evaluation of the results of the program as indicated by performance on the job of those who have gone through the program. Rose's notion of continuous evaluation is illustrated by the following outline of training evaluation.[26]

The Plan

Evaluation of:

1. Instructor qualifications
2. Occupational analysis and training needs
3. Objectives
4. The course of study and lesson plans
5. Instructional materials
6. Training aids and equipment
7. Examination

The Process

Evaluation of:

1. The application of learning teaching principles
2. Progress toward objectives indicated by student achievement, attitude, and performance

The Product

Evaluation of:

1. Periodic evaluation of the performance of graduates on the job

The training plan document should include an evaluation plan that identifies the elements to be evaluated and the evaluation techniques and standards. Including such information in the training plan can, for example, provide an immediate check for the measurableness of stated objectives and strategies. There is almost an intrinsic relationship between evaluation and program planning and describing that relationship in the plan document helps program managers and evaluators understand each other's requirements and responsibilities.

Finally, an evaluation plan assures program executives and the public that program managers are concerned about improving cost effectivenss, improving the quality of training, providing a meaningful assessment of training, and identifying and making recommendations about training policies, philosophies, procedures, and methodologies.

APPENDIX C

State Plans and Programs Supporting Training of Staff Serving the Developmentally Disabled

(A revision of this subsection has been postponed until the various agencies mentioned in Draft II have submitted comments)

APPENDIX C

The Role of State Planning Council in Addressing the Personnel Assessment Provision of the Law

The Michigan State Planning Council intends to involve, to the extent possible, the aforementioned departments in the process of assessing the adequacy of staff skills, training plans, and training programs. A thorough assessment of staff skills and state plans and programs will be time consuming. Significant amounts of information are not presently organized so as to faciliate such an assessment. Involvement of all the departments will enhance not only the possibility of a meaningful assessment but also the probability of departments improving their training efforts.

The Council intends to coordinate these efforts and provide technical assistance in such areas as developing appropriate models for developing a training plan, developing criteria to assess the adequacy of staff skill levels and state plans and programs, and coordinating overlapping training efforts.

In order to do the job well, the Council will undertake only what is practical. This requires a careful review of what needs to be done and the establishment of specific goals for this year. The Council does not intend to evaluate all employees working with developmentally disabled persons in the State. To do so would be to plan for failure. Such an evaluation is not practical. The Council intends to develop a model which can be used to plan training activities and to work with State agencies in improving existing training programs. All of the state agencies included in this section currently plan for and deliver staff inservice training. The Council will work with the agencies to assure that programs providing services to developmentally disabled persons recognize not only the need for training but also the need for a training plan document and evaluation of the planning and program processes.

APPENDIX C

Performance Goals for Fiscal Year 1979-80

1. To translate the "professional assessment" provision of the Developmental Disabilities and Bill of Rights Act so that measurable objectives are formulated.

2. To work with Departments of Mental Health, Education, Social Services, and Public Health to collect specific information regarding each Department's training efforts as they apply to staff providing services to developmentally disabled persons.

3. To develop planning models for training staff serving the developmentally disabled.

4. To develop a model plan document for training staff serving the developmentally disabled.

5. To work with the Departments of Mental Hea th, Education, Social Services, and Public Health to develop criteria for judging the adequacy of the skill level of professionals and paraprofessionals serving the developmentally disabled and the adequacy of state plans and programs providing training for such staff.

6. To provide the Departments of Mental Health, Education, Social Services, and Public Health with recommendations for improving their training efforts as a result of the collaborative assessment.

7. To promote an exchange of information between departments involved in similar training efforts for professionals and paraprofessionals serving the developmentally disabled.

8. To determine the involvement of departments other than the Departments of Mental Health, Education, Social Services, and Public Health in training professionals and paraprofessionals serving the developmentally disabled.

9. To work with the Departments of Mental Health, Education, Social Services, and Public Health to assess the adequacy of the skill level of professionals and paraprofessionals serving the developmentally disabled and the adequacy of state plans and programs providing training for such staff.

APPENDIX C

FOOTNOTES

[1]Alexander Braun, "Assessing Supervisory Training Needs and Evaluating Effectiveness," Training and Development Journal, February 1979, p. 3.

[2]Braun, loc. cit.

[3]Braun, op. cit., pp. 3-10.

[4]Yehezkel Dror, "The Planning Process: A Facet Design," in Fremont J. Lyden and Ernest G. Miller (eds.), Planning Programming Budgeting: A Systems Approach to Management, Markham Publishing Company, Chicago, 1970, pp. 93-111.

[5]Pamela A. Bernanke, and Jerry Parham, "A Conceptual Model for Program Planning and Evaluation," in Pamela A. Bernanke, Jerry Parham, and Linda Baucom (eds.), Program Planning and Evaluation in Community-Based Agencies, the Research and Training Center in Mental Retardation, Texas Tech Univ., Lubbock, Texas, 1978, pp. 4.1-4.11.

[6]Bernanke and Parham, op. cit., p. 4.1.

[7]Edward A. Suchman, Evaluative Research, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1967, p. 39.

[8]Homer C. Rose, The Development and Supervision of Training Programs, American Technical Society, U.S.A., 1964, p. 109.

[9]Robert F. Mager, Goal Analysis, Fearon Publishers, Belmont, p. 7.

[10]Braun, op. cit., p. 9.

[11]Bernanke and Parham, op. cit., pp. 4.2-4.5.

[12]Bernanke and Parham, loc. cit.

[13]Bernanke and Parham, op. cit., pp. 4.5-4.6.

[14]Bernanke and Parham, op. cit., p. 4.5.

[15]Edward A. Suchman, Evaluative Research, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1967, p. 38.

[16]Bernanke and Parham, op. cit., p. 4.5.

[17]Harold A. Hovey, The Planning-Programming-Budgeting Approach to Government Decision-Making, Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, New York, p. 20.

[18]Bernanke and Parham, op. cit., pp. 4.7-4.8.

[19]Rose, op. cit., pp. 148-158.

[20]Bernanke and Parham, op. cit., p. 4.7.

[21]Rose, op. cit., p. 204.

[22]Pamela A. Bernanke and Jerry Parham, "Evaluation: An Integral Part of Program Planning," in Pamela Bernanke, Jerry Parham, and Linda Baucom (eds.), Program Planning and Evaluation in Community-Based Agencies, the Research and Training Center in Mental Retardation, Texas Tech Univ., Lubbock, Texas, 1978, p. 7.1.

[23]Rose, op. cit., p. 204.

[24]Suchman, op. cit., p. 136.

[25]Rose, op. cit., pp. 204-231.

[26]Rose, op. cit., pp. 204-209.

APPENDIX D
SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

CONSULTATION/CONFERENCE ON SKILL ASSESSMENT AND TRAINING

Participant Comments Results
(25 Questionnaires Returned)

1. I am affiliated with:

DD Council	4/25 = 16%	Paraprofessional Association	1/25 = 4%
State Service Agency	6/25 = 24%	University Affiliated Facility	10/25 = 40%
Federal Agency	1/25 = 4%	Other	3/25 = 12%
Professional Association	0/25 = 0%	No Response	0

2. My role is that of a(n): (Multiple responses = 30)

Administrator	14/30 = 46.6%	Other	7/30 = 23.3%
Trainer	9/30 = 30%	No Response	1

	Helpful 4	3	2	Not Helpful 1	NR
3. I would rate the information presented as	11/25 = 44%	13/25 = 52%	1/25 = 4%	0/25 = 0%	0
4. I would rate the discussion as	13/25 = 52%	12/25 = 48%	0/25 = 0%	0/25 = 0%	0
5. I think future meetings of this issue would be	16/24 = 66.6%	3/24 = 12.5%	4/24 = 16.6%	1/24 = 4.2%	1
6. In general I would rate the program as being	12/25 = 48%	12/25 = 48%	1/25 = 4%	0/25 = 0%	0

7. The next level of discussion regarding these issues should be conducted at the: (30 responses)

National Level	2/30 = 6.6%	Local Level	1/30 = 3.3%
Regional Level	9/30 = 30%	Other	0/30 = 0%
State Level	18/30 = 60%	No Response	1

CONSULTATION/CONFERENCE ON SKILL ASSESSMENT AND TRAINING
Participant Comments Results
Page Two

8. The most helpful presentation/discussion was: (30 Positive Listings)

R. Miller	8	Reaction Panel	2
Group Discussion	7	T. Kramlinger	2
M. Montemerlo	6	Region V Reports	2
J. Nava	3		

9. The least helpful presentation/discussion was: (16 Negative Listings)

T. Kramlinger	9	Reaction Panel	1
R. Scheerenberger	4	Region V Update	1
M. Montemerlo	1		

10. Comments regarding meeting/lodging facilities: (20 Positive/6 Negative Comments)

Excellent	11	Rooms cold	1
Very Good/Good	9	Expensive ?	1
Facility too far from airport	4		

11. Comments on meeting organization and content: (30 Positive Comments)

Well Organized/ Very Good	13	Diversified content/ assortment of speakers	5
Chairman's leadership/flexibility of staff	9	Timely conference	3

12. Other comments: (10 Negative Comments)

Too many lectures first day	4	Attitude of Feds toward legislation	2
Planning/Evaluation not dealt with	3	Wisconsin and Minnesota Council members not present	1

"State Planning Council and Administration of Plan

"(1)(A) The plan must provide for the establishment of a State Planning Council, in accordance with section 137, for the assignment to the Council of personnel in such numbers and with such qualifications as the Secretary determines to be adequate to enable the Council to carry out its duties under that section, and for the identification of the personnel so assigned.

"(B) The plan must designate the State agency or agencies which shall administer or supervise the administration of the State plan and, if there is more than one such agency, the portion of such plan which each will administer (or the portion the administration of which each will supervise).

"(C) The plan must provide that each State agency designated under subparagraph (B) will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time reasonably require, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Secretary finds necessary to verify such reports.

"(A) The plan must provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure the proper disbursement of and accounting for funds paid to the State under this part.

"Description of Objectives and Services

"(2) The plan must—

"(A) set out the specific objectives to be achieved under the plan and a listing of the programs and resources to be used to meet such objectives;

"(B) describe (and provide for the review annually and revision of the description not less often than once every three years) (i) the extent and scope of services being provided, or to be provided, to persons with developmental disabilities under such other State plans for Federally assisted State programs as the State conducts relating to education for the handicapped, vocational rehabilition, public assistance, medical assistance, social services, maternal and child health, crippled children's services, and comprehensive health and mental health, and under such other plans as the Secretary may specify, and (ii) how funds alloted to the State in accordance with section 132 will be used to complement and augment rather than duplicate or replace services for persons with developmental disabilities which are eligible for Federal assistance under such other State programs;

"(C) for each fiscal year, assess and describe the extent and scope of the priority services (as defined in section 102(8)(B)) being or to be provided under the plan in the fiscal year; and

"(D) establish a method for the periodic evaluation of the plan's effectiveness in meeting the objectives described in subparagraph (A).

"Use of Funds

"(3) The plan must contain or be supported by assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that—

"(A) the funds paid to the State under section 132 will be used to make a significant contribution toward strengthening services for persons with developmental disabilities through agencies in the various political subdivisions of the State;

"(B) part of such funds will be made available by the State to public or nonprofit private entities;

"(C) such funds paid to the State under section 132 will be used to supplement and to increase the level of funds that would otherwise be made available for the purposes for which Federal funds are provided and not to supplant such non-Federal funds; and

"(D) there will be reasonable State financial priticipation in the cost of carrying out the State plan.

"Provision of Priority Services

"(4)(A) The plan must—

"(i) provide for the examination not less often than once every three years of the provision, and the need for the provision, in the State of the four different areas of priority services (as defined in section 102(8)(B)); and

"(ii) provide for the development, not later than the second year year in which funds are provided inder the plan after the date of the enactment of the Rehabilitation, Comprehensive Services, and Developmental Disabilities Amendments of 1978, and the timely review and revidion of a comprehensive statewide plan to plan, financially support, coordinate, and otherwise better address, on a statewide and comprehensive basis, unmet needs in the State for the provision of at least one of the areas of priority services, such area or areas to be specified in the plan, and (at the option of the State) for the provision of an additional area of services for the developmentally disabled, such area also to be specified in the plan.

"(B)(i) Except as provided in clause (iii), the plan must provide that not less than $100,000 or 65 percent of the amount available to the State under section 132, whichever is greater, will be expanded, as provided in clause (ii), for service activities in the areas of services specified in the plan under subparagraph (A)(ii).

"(ii) For any year in which the sums appropriated under section 131 do not exceed—

"(I) $60,000,000, not less than $100,000 or 65 percent of the amount available to the State under section 132, whichever is greater, must be expended for service activities in no more than two of the areas of services specified in the plan under subparagraph (A)(ii), and

"(II) $90,000,000, not less than $100,000 or 65 percent of the amount available to the State under section 132, whichever is greater, must be expended for service activities in no more than three of the areas of services specified in the plan under subparagraph (A)(ii).

"(iii) A State, in order to comply with clause (i) for a fiscal year beginning before January 1, 1980, is not required to reduce the amount which is available to it under section 132 and which is expended for planning activities below the amount so expended for planning activities in the preceding fiscal year, if substantially the remainder of the amount available to the State, which is expended for other than administration, is expended for service activities in the areas of services specified in the plan under subparagraph (A)(ii). For purposes of this clause, expenditures for planning activities do not include any expenditures for service activities (as defined in clause (iv)).

"(iv) For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'service activities' includes, with respect to an area of services, provision of services in the area, model service programs in the area, activities to increase the capacity of institutions and agencies to provide services in the area, coordinating the provision of services in the area with the provision of other services,

itreach to individuals for the provision of services in the area, the train-g of personnel to provide services in the area, and similar activities signed to expand the use and availability of services in the area.

"(C) Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), upon the application of a ate, the Secretary, pursuant to regulations which the Secretary shall pre-ribe, may permit the portion of the funds which must otherwise be ex-nded under the State plan for service activities in a limited number of eas of services to be expended for service activities in additional areas services if he determines that the expenditures of the State on service tivities in the initially specified areas of services has reasonably met the ed for those services in the State in comparison to the extent to which the ed for such additional area or areas of services has been met in such ate. Such additional areas shall, to the maximum extent feasible, be are thin the areas of priority services (as defined in section 102(8)(B)).

"(D) The plan must provide that special financial and technical as-tance shall be given to agencies or entities providing services for persons th developmental disabilities who are residents of geographical areas signated as urban or rural poverty areas.

Standards for Provision of Services and Protection of Rights of Recipients of Services

"(6)(A)(i) The plan must provide that services furnished, and the cilities in which they are furnished, under the plan for persons with velopmental disabilities will be in accordance with standards pre-ribed by the Secretary in regulations.

"(ii) The plan must provide satisfactory assurances that buildings ed in connection with the delivery of services assisted under the plan will et standards adopted pursuant to the Act of August 12, 1968 (42 .S.C. 4151–4157) (known as the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968).

"(B) The plan must provide that services are provided in an indi-dualized manner consistent with the requirements of section 112 (relating habilitation plans).

"(C) The plan must contain or be supported by assurances satisfactory the Secretary that the human rights of all persons with developmental abilities (especially those persons without familial protection) who are eiving treatment, services, or habilitation under programs assisted under s title will be protected consistent with section 111 (relating to rights of developmentally disabled).

"(D) The plan must provide assurances that the State has undertaken irmative steps to assure the participation in programs under this title individuals generally representative of the population of the State, with rticular attention to the participation of members of minority groups.

64 *"Professional Assessment and Evaluation Systems* ←

"(6) The plan must provide for—

"(A) an assessment of the adequacy of the skill level of professionals and paraprofessionals serving persons with developmental disabilities in the State and the adequacy of the State programs and plans supporting training of such professionals and paraprofessionals in maintaining the high quality of services provided to persons with developmental disabilities in the State; and

"Utilization of VISTA Personnel; Effect of Deinstitutionalization

"(7)(A) The plan must provide for the maximum utilization of all available community resources including volunteers serving under the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 (Public Law 93–113) and other appropriate voluntary organizations, except that such volunteer services shall supplement, and shall not be in lieu of, services of paid employees.

"(B) The plan must provide for fair and equitable arrangements (as determined by the Secretary after consultation with the Secretary of Labor) to protect the interests of employees affected by actions under the plan to provide alternative community living arrangement services (as defined in section 102(8)(E)), including arrangements designed to preserve employee rights and benefits and to provide training and retraining of such employees where necessary and arrangements under which maximum efforts will be made to guarantee the employment of such employees.

"Additional Information and Assurances Required by Secretary

"(8) The plan also must contain such additional information and assurances as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this part.".

(b) Section 133(d)(1) is amended by striking out "for such purpose" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the total expenditures for such purpose by all of the State agencies designated under subsection (b)(1)(B) for the administration or supervision of the administration of the State plan".

(c) Section 133(d)(2) is amended by striking out "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "during the previous fiscal year".

STATE PLANNING COUNCILS

SEC. 512. (a) Subsection (a) of section 137 is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) Each State which receives assistance under this part shall establish a State Planning Council which will serve as an advocate for persons with developmental disabilities (as defined in section 102(7)). The members of the State Planning Council of a State shall be appointed by the Governor of the State from among the residents of that State. The Governor of each State shall make appropriate provisions for the rotation of membership on the Council of his respective State. Each State Planning Council shall at all times include in its membership representatives of the principal State agencies, higher education training facilities, local agencies, and nongovernmental agencies and groups concerned with services to persons with developmental disabilities in that State.

"(2) At least one-half of the membership of each such Council shall consist of persons who—

"(A) are persons with developmental disabilities or parents or guardians of such persons, or 65

"(B) are immediate relatives or guardians of persons with mentally impairing developmental disabilities,

who are not employees of a State agency which receives funds or provides services under this part, who are not managing employees (as defined in section 1126(b) of the Social Security Act) of any other entity which receives funds or provides services under this part, and who are not persons

"(3) Of the members of the Council described in paragraph (2)—
"(A) at least one-third shall be persons with developmental disabilities, and
"(B)(i) at least one-third shall be individuals described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2), and (ii) at least one of such individuals shall be an immediate relative or guardian of an institutionalized person with a developmental disability.".

(b) Section 137(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each State Planning Council shall—
"(1) develop jointly with the State agency or agencies designated, under section 133(b)(1)(B) the State plan required by this part, including the specification of areas of services under section 133(b)(4)(A)(ii);
"(2) monitor, review, and evaluate, not less often than annually, the implementation of such State plan;
"(3) to the maximum extent feasible, review and comment on all State plans in the State which relate to programs affecting persons with developmental disabilities; and
"(4) submit to the Secretary, through the Governor, such periodic reports on its activities as the Secretary may reasonably request, and keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Secretary finds necessary to verify such reports.".

(c) Section 137 is amended by striking out subsection (c).

SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS

SEC. 13. (a) Section 145 is amended—
(1) by inserting "(particularly priority services)" after "otherwise improving services" in subsection (a)(1);
(2) by striking out ", including programs" and all that follows through the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and";
(3) by striking out "subsection (d)" in subsections (e) and (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (f)" each place it appears;
(4) by redesignating subsections (b) through (f) as subsections (d) through (h), respectively;
(5) by inserting after paragraph (1) of subsection (a) the following (and redesignating paragraphs (2) through (9) of subsection (a) as paragraphs (1) through (8), respectively):
"(2) demonstrations (and research, training, and evaluation in connection therewith) for establishing programs which hold promise of expanding or otherwise improving protection and advocacy services related to the state protection and advocacy system (described in section 113).
"(b) Grants provided under subsection (a) shall include grants for—"; and
(6) by inserting before subsection (d), as so redesignated, the following new subsection:
"(c) The Secretary shall establish procedures to insure participation of persons with developmental disabilities and their parents or guardians in determining priorities to be utilized by the Secretary in making grants under this section.".

(b) Section 145(b), as amended by subsection (a) of this section, is amended (1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (7), (2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:
"(9) developing or demonstrating innovative methods to attract and retain professionals to serve in rural areas in the habilitation of persons with developmental disabilities.".

(c) Section 145(f), as so redesignated, is amended (1) by striking out "and" after "1977,", and (2) by inserting before the period the following: $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, $22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, and $26,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981".

TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 514. (a) Section 112 is amended—
(1) by striking out "after September 30, 1976," in subsection (a);
(2) by striking out "Such" in subsection (b)(3) and inserting in lieu thereof "The"; and
(3) by striking out "an" before "objective criteria" in clause (B) of subsection (b)(3).

(b) Section 134 is amended—
(1) by striking out "CONSTRUCTION," in its heading,
(2) by striking out "(a)" in subsection (a), and
(3) by striking out subsection (b).

(c) Section 135 is amended—
(1) by striking out "CONSTRUCTION," in its heading;
(2) by striking out "(a)" in subsection (a); and
(3) by striking out subsection (b).

(d) The heading to part C is amended to read as follows:

"PART C—GRANTS FOR PLANNING AND PROVISION OF SERVICES FOR PERSONS WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES"

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 515. The amendments made by this title shall apply to payments under title I of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act for fiscal years beginning on and after October 1, 1978.

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert:

An Act to amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to extend certain programs established in such Act, to establish a community service employment program for handicapped individuals, and to provide comprehensive services for independent living for handicapped individuals, to amend the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act to revise and extend the programs under that Act, and for other purposes.

And the Senate agree to the same.

APPENDIX E

57